EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NIXON SHAPES COURT IN BEST TRADITION

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's selection of Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., chief judge of the Fourth Judicial Circuit of the U.S. Court of Appeals, to fill the remaining vacancy on the bench of the U.S. Supreme Court has prompted a thoughtful editorial appearing in the Jackson Citizen Patriot of Jackson, Mich., on August 21, 1969. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

NIXON SHAPES COURT IN BEST TRADITION

With his second appointment to the United States Supreme Court bench President Nixon is making far more waves than he did when he selected Warren E. Burger to succeed the retiring and controversial Chief Justice Earl Warren.

The Burger appointment won almost universal acceptance, if not acclaim, because of his unquestioned qualifications as a professional jurist and the lack of controversy in his record. Moreover, the appointment took place while the President still was enjoying his honeymoon with Congress. Also his choice was regarded as an act of exercising a President's prerogative of shaping the court to his own political philosophies—if, in the eyes of his enemies, he doesn't over do it.

Now that the bloom has gone off the new administration and the political sabers are rattling and the switchblade knives are clicking, Mr. Nixon is taking some flack for his appointment of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth Jr. to succeed the ill-fated Abe Fortas. The most noise is coming from liberals and racial groups who feel that the appointee may not come close to following the Warren Court's line on civil and individual rights cases.

Judge Haynsworth's record on the federal bench is difficult to characterize as either conservative or liberal, especially in the civil rights field. The consensus, even among his critics, is that it comes out somewhere slightly to the right of center. It might be said that he is the balance wheel type.

All things considered, that isn't a bad position for a man chosen to sit on the highest court in the land. Moreover, it is in keeping with the President's own inclinations.

The main objections of the President's critics seem to be that he did not emulate Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt, Lyndon Johnson and John F. Kennedy by tapping a candidate of extremely liberal views.

That, however, would not have been in keeping with political traditions which were followed by FDR, JFK and LBJ. The liberal Democrats shaped the court to their philosophies and in so doing upset conservatives, even as liberals are being upset today by Mr. Nixon.

The President is playing the same game, but in a low key. He is by no means going as far to the right as his predecessors did to the left.

Another point that the critics should keep in mind is that no President can be absolutely certain that his appointees to the court will perform in keeping with their prior records.

Justice Hugo Black, dean of the court and one of its most outspoken liberals on civil and individual rights cases, was a former dues-paying member of the Ku Klux Klan, a fact which President Roosevelt learned to his great dismay only after he had paid his political debt to Dixie by naming Black to the court.

Earl Warren, President Eisenhower's most controversial appointee to the court, as chief justice went almost diametrically against the philosophies he had expressed on civil and individual rights as governor of California.

At bottom in weighing the rightness of this situation is the basic concept of the role of the Supreme Court as the impartial interpreter of law. This function has been overshadowed by political custom and practice since the very beginning of the Republic.

The ideals put in word by the authors of the Constitution envisioned the appointment to the court of men renowned for their qualifications as jurists, rather than for their political leanings or philosophies. Otherwise, the Founding Fathers would not have provided lifetime terms for them.

This concept, however, should not rule out the right of the President to make appointments in keeping with the will of the people as expressed through the ballot box in presidential elections.

This means, for example, that President Nixon would be thwarting the will of the people, as expressed in his election last year, if he named another Abe Fortas to replace Abe Fortas.

The game becomes sticky when presidents use this rationalization to range far afield in their choices for the court.

Competence, rather than far offcenter philosophy, should be the controlling factor in the choice of Supreme Court Justices. President Nixon appears to have followed that reasoning in his choice of Haynsworth.

SS "HOPE"

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, during the adjournment of Congress, which ended today, the hospital ship SS *Hope* sailed from Wilmington, Del., on its eighth mission of mercy.

The *Hope* left August 29 for a 10-month training and treatment mission to Tunisia. This voyage marks the first Mediterranean visit for the *Hope*, although in the past 10 years the ship has called in many ports in Asia, Latin America, and tropical Africa.

The ship's first voyage was in 1960, when it visited Indonesia and South Vietnam. Since then it has called in Peru, Ecuador, Guinea, Nicaragua, Colombia, and Ceylon.

Although the SS *Hope* is most widely known for its training of medical personnel and treatment of the less-fortunate in countries around the world, Project Hope this year has undertaken a new responsibility. It now operates two training programs—one in the Mexican-American community of Laredo, Tex., and another on the Navajo Indian reservation at Ganado, Ariz. Thus, while the ship's personnel is performing vital duties in North Africa this year, others involved in Project Hope will be providing important training here in the United States.

I know all Senators join with me in wishing the SS *Hope* a good and profitable tour in Tunisia and in congratulating the Project on the establishment of the domestic training programs.

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE

HON. BILL D. BURLISON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Missouri's outstanding senior Senator, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, has just recently visited and spoken in my district. This distinguished American is considered one of our country's foremost statesmen because of unique and far-reaching experience; that is, the only Senator who is a member of both the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, and our Nation's first Secretary of the Air Force.

Not so well known is Senator SYMINGTON's expertise in the field of agriculture. This is unfortunate in view of the many years of dedication that he has given to the farmer and his problems. This is the subject of the Senator's recent address before the Missouri Cotton Producer's Association in Portageville, Mo. It is my wish to share these remarks with my colleagues in the Congress. The speech follows:

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE

It is indeed a pleasure to meet here today with the leaders of agriculture in Southeast Missouri.

Even though much of my time in this session of the Congress has been devoted to various problems such as taxation, tax reform, and national security, I have become increasingly concerned about the problems of this the most important industry in our State: the production, processing and distribution of food and fiber.

It is trite, but it is true, that without a healthy farm economy, we cannot have real national security.

For cotton, soybean and grain producers, the cost-price squeeze has intensified rather than eased over the past year.

As recently as 1966, there was growing concern about the ability to satisfy world food needs. We were concerned about the capacity of American farmers to provide ample foods and fibers to satisfy domestic and foreign markets. But today, only 3 years later, we have idled almost 60 million acres of productive cropland and are currently producing sufficient wheat and soybeans which will add significantly to existing stocks.

It should be stressed that, despite these millions of unused acres, we will be producing enough cotton and feed grains to fully supply domestic and foreign markets.

You all are well acquainted with the developments that brought about this major change; but because of their continuing influence, I would like to review them briefly.

The adoption of improved varieties of food grains, combined with better weather and increased use of fertilizers and insecticides in less developed countries such as India, Pakistan and the Philippines have increased substantially the production of food grains in those countries; that development in turn decreasing the need for Public Law 480 shipments of wheat, rice and grain sorghums.

Increased production of both cotton and man-made fibers abroad has decreased the demand for United States cotton exports; and increased use of manmade fibers at home has caused a reduction in the utilization of cotton. This has occurred to the extent that less than 8.5 million bales were used by domestic mills in the year ending July 31.

Although livestock production has been expanding at a rapid rate, both at home and abroad, urea is being substituted for high protein cottonseed and soybean meals at an increasing rate in cattle feeding.

This development, together with increased United States production of soybeans, and increased production of sunflower seed, especially in the Soviet Union, will result this year in the largest carryover of soybeans on record; and current prospects are for an even larger carryover in 1970.

Increased technical and financial capabilities of large scale manufacturing firms assure a continued expansion of synthetic products that can only compete for agriculture's markets. A recent study in the United States Department of Agriculture concluded that synthetics and substitutes have taken 10 percent of the fats and oils market for soaps, 15 percent of the market for glycerine, 12 percent of the leather market for shoe uppers, 6 percent of the oilseed meal market, 9 percent of the citrus market; and although smaller percentages of the markets for wool, sugar, starch and fluid milk, these substitutes have taken 19 percent of the cotton market.

With an excess capacity problem in agriculture and widespread hunger and malnutrition among our poor, it is not surprising that many people believe the farm problem could be solved by increasing the spending power of those with the lowest incomes. Those of us who helped expand the Food Stamp program in recent years believe we must continue to expand and improve our food stamp, school feeding and nutrition education programs, until they are available to all the hungry in our land.

It is noteworthy, however, to realize that even if the underprivileged were given an additional $3.5 billion for food expenditures, equivalent to all farm program payments in recent years, food consumption would be increased only 2 percent; and actually, consumption of food grains would probably decline, because low-income people usually reduce their cereal consumption, and increase their use of livestock products as their purchasing power goes up.

Farmers of the United States have the capacity to produce 10 to 12 percent more farm products than can be marketed at the present time; but only a small part of this excess capacity can be utilized profitably by means of expanded food stamp and school feeding programs.

Analysts in the Economic Research Service conclude food expenditures would have to increase about $25 billion to expand demand for farm products sufficiently to replace, through the market, the $3.5 billion farmers now receive in direct payments.

In view of this continuing problem of excess capacity in agriculture, it is encouraging to note that 17 farm and commodity organizations have joined together in recommending an extension of the basic features of the Agricultural Act of 1965. The more unity which can be developed among the people of agriculture, the greater our chance for sound legislation.

I share the concern of a great American, Senator Allen Ellender, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that the new Administration may attempt to substitute a massive long-range cropland retirement program for the annual commodity adjustment programs.

Iowa State University and others have made studies which indicate lower annual costs could be attained with moderate long-term land retirement programs. Senator Ellender, who has done so very much for American farmers over the years, has wisely asked Secretary Hardin to evaluate these and other similar studies for his Committee.

Secretary Hardin concluded that the actual cost of long-term cropland retirement would be far higher than the studies reported and that the production of the major crops—wheat, feed grains, soybeans and cotton—would be greater than in recent years even though 70 million acres were retired. Gross and net farm incomes would fall below the levels of recent years unless more than 70 million acres were retired.

Just as farmers are caught in a cost price squeeze, and therefore are proposing amendments which would increase farm income, Secretary Hardin and the Bureau of the Budget are caught in a budget squeeze, and therefore will propose amendments designed to reduce government costs.

The great need is for policies and programs which will increase farm income without increasing government costs, for improvements which will reduce costs without reducing farm income.

In recent years, proposals to limit payments to a miximum of 5, 10, 20 or 25 thousand dollars to an individual producer have received increasing approval in the House of Representatives. Right now, as your outstanding Congressman Bill Burlison well knows, the agricultural appropriation bill passed by the House on May 27 and by the Senate on July 27, has not yet gone to conference because of the demand in the House for payment limitations.

Secretary Hardin and others who have studied these proposals conclude that the supply adjustment goals of the annual programs could be achieved even though large farm program payments were limited, but they also warn these limitations could result in increased surpluses; and therefore increased government storage costs.

Any payment limitation would affect more cotton growers than wheat or feed grain producers; but out of 449,376 cotton growers who received payments in 1968, only some 5,000 would be affected by the $20,000 limitation voted by the House this year.

If a payment limitation were at the lowest level ever proposed, only 8 percent of the cotton producers, namely 34,000, would be affected; and this would probably result in record production and record surpluses of cotton in storage.

Note also that a $5,000 payment limitation would affect only 3 percent of the wheat producers and but 2 percent of the feed grain producers.

As you all know, I do not believe in the principle of limiting payments to individual farm operators, who help all of agriculture by limiting their production. We do not put a ceiling on the benefits to a great corporation like General Motors from the standpoint of protection through tariffs, or to the big oil companies from oil import quotas. Nor to the large magazines from mail subsidies.

Despite problems of payments limitation and its obvious unfairness, some of the most knowledgeable of our farm leaders believe a continuation of existing programs, even though subjected to a payment limitation. would be far better than no program at all. This may be a choice which will have to be made at some time in the future.

According to our best estimates, if the Congress is unable to agree on an extension of current commodity programs, farm income will drop by approximately 5 billion dollars—3.5 billion dollars in payments along with up to 1.5 billion dollars in lower farm income due to overproduction and lower prices.

We have many other domestic economic problems and situations abroad which are both costly and tragic.

So let us all work together to develop the best possible farm programs; for cotton, for food and feed grains, for the wise utilization of our abundance in feeding and clothing the hungry and naked. In that way we will have more prosperous agriculture, and a more secure America, and a better world in which to live.

HAS CRIME'S TIDE CRESTED?

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Federal Bureau of Investigation recently released a report on major crime in the United States during 1969.

Although this report reveals that the serious crime rate went up 16 percent and the rate of police solutions to major crime has decreased steadily, an August 14, 1969, editorial in the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., points out that "there is a ray of hope shining through the dull statistics on increasing law violations."

Reasons for this hope are twofold. First, the United States has a tough Attorney General, John Mitchell; and, this editorial says:

> His every action and word since taking office has been directed toward hard-nosed action against criminals who have been terrorizing decent American citizens.

Second, the Supreme Court is changing, and Greenville News Editor Wayne Freeman says:

> There is hope the restrictive decisions of past years may be modified, and that Congress will enact laws to protect ordinary people from criminals.

The editorial itself concludes with a ray of hope, saying that 1969 may become the year in which the high tide of crime begins to recede.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial, entitled "Has Crime's Tide Crested?" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAS CRIME'S TIDE CRESTED?

The Federal Bureau of Investigation's report on major crime in the United States during 1969, released yesterday, is a sobering document. Yet there is a ray of hope shinning through the dull statistics of increasing law violations.

The central fact in the report is that the serious crime rate jumjed 16 per cent. In 1968 there were 2,235 serious crimes per 100,000 population.

The violent crime rate went up 18 per cent to 295 victims per 100,000 population. The property crime rate was up 16 per cent to 1,940 victims per 100,000.

The surge of lawlessness, continuing to outstrip the population growth, was felt throughout the nation. Suburban crime went up 17 per cent, big city crime jumped 18 per cent, rural crime rose 11 per cent. By regions the percentages of increase were 22 for the Northeast, 16 for the South, 18 for the West and 13 for the North Central states.

Crime definitely has done its part to fulfill the old slogan for the current decade—the Soaring Sixties: the volume of crime has risen 122 per cent, outstripping population growth 11 to one. The risk of becoming a victim has nearly doubled.

Meanwhile, the rate of police solutions to major crime has decreased steadily, declining seven per cent in 1968 for a 32 per cent drop since 1960.

Summing up, the dry, hard statistics reveal the continuing alarming deterioration in "domestic tranquility," one of the main constitutional purposes of government in the United States.

While the 1968 crime figures are totally dismal, there is some hope when they are placed alongside preliminary statistics for the first three months of 1969. Those figures show a general leveling (not yet a decrease, by any means) in serious crimes throughout the United States.

The early 1969 figures are too tenuous and the three-month span is too brief to justify any real hope that a new trend is in the making. Yet it is the first bright ray in many a year. Maybe, just maybe, this country has reached a turning point.

It must be remembered that the Johnson administration still was in power throughout 1968. Ramsay Clark, the non-enforcer of criminal law, presided over the Justice Department. In fact the 1960s have been dominated by the Johnson-Kennedy administrations during which sociology almost replaced criminology in federal law enforcement circles.

The decade also has been the era of the Warren Supreme Court which emphasized the "rights" of the accused over the rights of crime's victims and society in general. The decline in police solutions probably can be laid at the door of the Escobedo-Miranda type decisions stripping officers of many powers to investigate, arrest and prosecute.

Things have changed now. The tough John Mitchell sits as attorney general. His every action and word since taking office has been directed toward hard-nosed action against criminals who have been terrorizing decent American citizens. By example alone, Mr. Mitchell, firmly backed by President Nixon, has stiffened the spines of law enforcement men all over the country.

The Supreme Court is changing, too. Warren is no longer the chief. There is hope the restrictive decisions of past years may be modified, and that Congress will enact laws to protect ordinary people from criminals.

A changed atmosphere may be the reason for the slight shift in the crime curve early in 1969. Criminals themselves may be getting the message and easing off.

At any rate the sad figures of 1968 are proof of the fact that the softhearted approach to crime and criminals is no answer to the problem.

The country has had enough overemphasis of the "constitutional rights" of criminals. The time has come for courts and Congress to join the administration to emphasize the constitutional right of non-criminals to domestic tranquillity.

If this nation has learned that the anguish of crime's victims is more repugnant to the Constitution than offending the sensibilities of criminals, 1969 may become the year in which the high tide of crime begins to recede.

THE REPUBLIC REPULSED

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, crime is a matter of grave concern, affecting the lives of everyone. In spite of efforts of our dedicated law enforcement officers, patriotic organizations, civic groups, and individual citizens, the crime rate continues to go up, however. The FBI reports a 10-percent increase in serious crimes for the first half of this year over 1968. And, what makes it all the more appalling is the fact that crime in 1968 was up 19 percent over the previous year and nearly double that of 1960. The estimated annual cost of crime is put at $31 billion.

There has been much clamor for anticrime programs on a national basis. The glare of nationwide publicity on such programs is helpful, of course, but nothing alters the fact that every crime is local. It is in the local community, in our own neighborhoods, that crime can and must be curbed.

It is in the local community that the basic tool in the fight against crime must be honed and whetted—that basic tool is respect for the law. Regardless of the many excuses made for law violations, the fact remains crystal clear that the crime that is rampant today is the product of disrespect for the laws.

Many court decisions have encouraged this disrespect for law and for our law enforcement officers. This must be reversed.

Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess it was my privilege to attend the American Legion's national convention in Atlanta, Ga. At this convention there was presented an unvarnished but comprehensive summary of the situation as it is today by the Honorable Robert K. Konkle, superintendent of the Indiana State Police. His topic was: "The Republic Repulsed." I include these brief excerpts of Superintendent Konkle's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

EXCERPTS FROM "THE REPUBLIC REPULSED"

I tell you this day the Republic has been repulsed. Our laws have been rendered ineffective, our Christian heritage assailed, our educational system corrupted, our patriotism diluted by ridicule and all segments of our society must share some of the blame . . .

It is my opinion that some members of the judicial system have condoned the rape of liberty for the gratification of the individual. That the scales of justice have been tipped by the decisions adjudicating the law in a manner which they would like to see it—instead of what it is.

I firmly believe that society has rights and that individual liberty is secondary to the whole, where there has been due process.

I would remind all that no individual freedom can last except in an orderly society. Can we hope to be freer or more secure in the pursuit of happiness by limiting police powers because of a supposed fear of abuse—while at the same time we are in a greater danger from those criminals that have increased crime nine times faster than the growth of our population—and still others who commit fraud, violence and murder in the name of individual liberty or their sociological beliefs?

We will lose this Republic by the weight of numbers. The numbers of crimes that go unsolved. The numbers of thefts, rapes, robberies and frauds untried because we have not provided enough trained police to investigate and apprehend—enough prosecutors to try the cases—enough courts to hear them and, most serious of all, enough citizens who will serve as witnesses or jurors and take up the responsibility of citizenship.

There is no order in a society that permits one citizen to perpetrate crimes against another in the guise of liberty. Nor does law exist where threats, intimidation and assault by person against person is condoned.

The world today changes in seconds instead of centuries. A society that does not progress to insure equality of protection for all its citizens in each f cet of its growth condemns itself to destruction.

In order to insure that degree of security each of us would garner unto himself and his posterity, those charged to enforce the laws must be so equipped as to capably meet all assaults upon America.

America is under the greatest attack today that she has known in a century. Greater from within, perhaps, than from without.

We are fast becoming an armed camp. The leftist radicals and militants joining on the one side and the radicals of the right on the other. We know that these groups have been arming themselves for some time. For what? To take over when government fails.

You, the citizen, and we, the police, are in the middle—and you want out!

Things are going to get much worse before they get much better unless there is a fast and firm action taken to change thinking today.

This thin blue line—this thin blue line of policemen is all that holds this country together and they are wavering from the assault on the one side and the lack of support on the other. If this line ever breaks this country will be so irretrievably lost that no army will ever restore the freedoms that we now have.

The leftists now say they intend to overthrow our government. They have resorted to violence. They are arming and they are moving from the college campuses to the high schools and grade schools.

There is now an assault to break the ranks of labor via the "work-in" program. Labor says they won't make it. But author Phillip A. Luce says that the United Auto Workers funds have, for years, been used to finance SDS activities.

We know that the use of drugs, sex, alcohol and guilt are being used to enlist the youth of this Nation to their cause. If you question this let me tell you that drug offenses have gone up 400 per cent over the last year and that more illegal liquor is being drunk today than during prohibition.

They hook young girls on dope and then prostitute them to get money to fund their campaigns.

Other groups are blackmailing cities for money. They say "give or we march, burn and destroy!"

Governmental programs and funds have been used to finance individuals and whatever causes they are interested in.

They charge police with brutality and, yet, policemen are constantly being assaulted. They are attempting in every way they know how to destroy the police image. They have to in order to achieve their purpose because the police represent law and they cannot operate within the law.

You are not afraid to walk down the street because of police brutality. But why do they want you to think this way? It is communist propaganda to destroy America.

We have college professors who are teaching un-Americanism in our colleges. We know some who have aided and abetted the leftists by furnishing them advice on how to circumvent the law. They have also furnished money and transportation.

We see some of the same faces showing up at one demonstration after another and yet we hear the riots are spontaneous. We can prove they are not.

We find the bank accounts of student leaders swelled by large cash deposits which cannot be traced.

We have found caches of arms and explosives in large quantities.

Now we have SDS members graduating from college and teaching these theories to our first graders. Recently, in a New York community, parents discovered teachers in their high school teaching 20th Century revolution tactics and making students submit term papers on how to sabotage the community!

We have governmental officials and university administrators who are appeasing dissenters and political leaders lending support to radicals.

The irresponsible, responsible people of government make such statements as "Elect my candidate and there won't be any police brutality. There won't be any police!"

DAY OF SHAME

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the AFL-CIO News of August 30 contains a statement of its clear and unequivocal support of Czechoslovakians who for a year have found their country under the iron-heeled domination of the Soviet Red Army.

It is clear that a great majority of Americans are sympathetic to the problems which beset these valiant people. I invite attention to the fact that the largest organization in the United States, reported to represent millions of American workers, is on record opposing the vicious oppression of the totalitarian regime in Czechoslovakia.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"DAY OF SHAME" MARKS CZECHOSLOVAK INVASION

The AFL-CIO has reiterated its "clear, unequivocal support" for the heroic struggle of Czechoslovakians to free themselves from the year-old Soviet occupation.

A message of labor's support was delivered by Henry Kirsch of the AFL-CIO Dept. of International Affairs to a protest meeting calling attention to the anniversary of the August 1968 invasion by the Red Army and other Warsaw Pact troops.

The meeting to mark the "day of shame" was sponsored by Czechoslovak democratic organizations in the United States. On hand were more than 200 persons, including prominent Americans from many fields.

Kirsch expressed "pride" at being designated to represent the AFL-CIO at the meeting and proclaim its backing of suffering Czechoslovak people in their quest for freedom and independence.

He spelled out the federation's views as expressed in a statement adopted by the AFL-CIO Executive Council at its recent meeting.

The statement challenged Soviet rulers to show the sincerity of their indicated desires for rapprochement with the West by withdrawing troops from Czechoslovakia and restoring the status quo that existed prior to the invasion.

The protest meeting adopted a proclamation appealing to all governments and citizens of free nations to "insist on an immediate withdrawal of the Soviet invaders from Czechoslovak territory."

It asked the United Nations to secure "the restoration of fundamental human rights" for Czechoslovakia and all other Soviet satellites.

A DEPARTMENT OF EXPLORATION

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the science editor of Saturday Review, John Lear, has recently suggested a skillful and unique rationale for the formation of a new Department of Exploration.

The idea was expressed in an editorial contained in Saturday Review on August 23, 1969. While a large number of bills have been introduced looking toward some reorganization of the Cabinet structure involving many of the same agencies referred to, I am unaware of any which take this precise approach. I am certain that Members will find the editorial worthy of their attention:

A DEPARTMENT OF EXPLORATION

Now that the moon's far hemisphere is in reach of earthly explorers, it is appropriate to recall the time when the land mass between the Mississippi River and the Pacific Ocean seemed almost as inaccessible as the near hemisphere of the moon. It is also appropriate to identify the man who sent his secretary, Meriwether Lewis, and a retired Indian fighter, William Clark, on an expedition to pierce that great western wilderness of the North American continent. This remarkable person was the idealist who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Virginia statute for religious freedom: Thomas Jefferson.

Jefferson was the only practicing scientist ever to occupy the White House. Herbert Hoover? A practicing technologist. One of the many scientific documents left behind by Jefferson was his detailed letter of instructions for the Lewis and Clark expedition. Verbatim excerpts from it are in Paul Russell Cutright's new University of Illinois Press book, *Lewis and Clark: Pioneering Naturalists*.

President Richard M. Nixon's recent guarantee that explorers from earth would discover life on another planet by the year 2000 places him rather apart from Jefferson's scientific method. But even if the truth were otherwise, time would hardly allow Mr. Nixon to plan a manned trip to Mars as meticulous as Jefferson planned Lewis and Clark's reconnaissance of the Louisiana Purchase. Nevertheless, Mr. Nixon could adapt the Jeffersonian philosophy to prevent disastrous backfire from the anticlimatic euphoria that has followed the voyage of *Apollo 11*.

We obviously aren't going to Mars on the optimistic timetable proposed by Vice President Spiro Agnew. Congress won't authorize payment of the bill, and the White House knows it—a fact the September report from Mr. Nixon's advisory panel on space exploration will certainly reflect. If the President is not to lose the initiative he seized so vigorously by telephoning the moon on the night of the *Apollo 11* landing, he must find an alternative that fits the American tradition.

Mr. Nixon could inspire all the peoples of the planet by creating within his Cabinet a new Department of Exploration. A declaration of intent to inaugurate such a civilian agency would capture the intellectual stimulus and visceral excitement of the initial lunar landing and thrust them onward.

Wherever unknowns wait, wherever mysteries remain uncovered or unexplained—in the space beyond earth's atmosphere, within the atmosphere, on and under the surface of the seas, in the crust of the planet, in the mantle under the crust, in the core beneath the mantle, in the immensity of the stars, and in the microscopic smallness of the atom—there the Department of Exploration would be instructed to venture.

Such a forthright commitment to the future, such a statement of belief in the necessity for change, would constitute a rebirth of the original American experiment. Psychologically it would be electric. And it would not be a superficial political trick. The new department would serve a major practical purpose. It would provide a compelling focus for reorganization of scientific capabilities within the federal government.

Pressure for some kind of reassembly of the present-day government structure is now so strong that a new department, under whatever name, seems inevitable within the next few years. Many scientists favor a reorganization, but many fear that an all-inclusive Department of Science would encompass too much; it could not be functional in terms of mission. A Department of Exploration would be highly functional, yet ample enough to take in all the disciplines required by human ecology.

A logical nucleus for a Department of Exploration already exists in the Environmental Science Services Administration. ESSA combined the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory of the Bureau of Standards. Earlier this year [*SR*, Feb. 1], former President Lyndon B. Johnson's Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources proposed creation of a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA) to explore the sea and the atmosphere as a continuum. Along with ESSA, NOAA would have taken in the Coast Guard, two bureaus of fisheries and wildlife, the National Sea Grant Program of the National Science Foundation, the [Great] Lake Survey of the U.S. Army Engineers, and the National Oceanographic Data Center. A truly functional Department of Exploration also would include the National Center for Atmospheric Research, the High Altitude Laboratory, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the weather modification capabilities of NSF, the Antarctic exporation responsibilities of NSF and the U.S. Navy, the non-military aspects of the national laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the planetary crustal probings of the U.S. Geological Survey.

Regular public accounting of the vast amounts of tax money now going into science would be facilitated through the apparatus of a Department of Exploration. Fair assignment of priorities to the exploration of extraterrestrial space, the atmosphere, the oceans, and the earth's interior would be simplified. Transfer of technological advances from one area of study to another would be speeded. And the pursuit of peace through direction of science toward fulfillment of man's felt needs would be encouraged in myriad ways.

BURGLARY REVISED

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the common law definition of burglary—that the offense be a forced entry into a dwelling during the nighttime—has been enlarged by the FBI to include the unlawful entry of any structure at any hour with the intention of committing a felony.

A reason for this, according to an editorial in the State, Columbia, S.C., is that burglars are more and more favoring daylight hours for their crimes, finding unattended apartments and homes easy prey. Daylight burglaries have, in fact, increased 247 percent since 1960.

This editorial warns the public that burglary is one of the safest forms of crime. "The smart operator," it says, "faces little risk of detection and finds little to block his entry into homes. As a result, only one in five burglaries was solved during 1968." It states further that citizens would be wise to ponder these facts and check their residences and not make the crimes easier for the criminals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding editorial entitled "Burglary Revised," published in the State, Columbia, S.C., August 23, 1969, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURGLARY REVISED

An essential element in the crime of burglary, under the common law definition, is that the offense occur at a dwelling and during the night-time.

This restrictive definition, however, has proved inadequate to describe the activities of modern burglars and the FBI has enlarged it to include the unlawful entry of any structure at any hour with the intention of committing a felony.

FBI statistics on crime indicate that the second-story artists more and more are favoring daylight hours for the pursuit of their profession. They find unattended apartments and homes easy prey. Daytime burglaries were up 21 per cent in 1968 alone and have increased 247 per cent since 1960. They now account for over half of the burglaries committed in residences. On the other hand, sunshine burglaries make up only six per cent of those occuring in non-residences.

Burglary is also a rather seasonal profession. The peak periods are in July and August (vacation time) and during the weeks around Christmas.

For the record, the average dollar loss per burglary is $298. The burglar is more apt to be male (96 per cent) and white (over 60 per cent).

FBI reports unhappily indicate that, from the standpoint of the criminal, burglary is one of the safest forms of crime. The smart operator faces little risk of detection and finds little to block his entry into homes. As a result, only one in five burglaries was solved during 1968.

Citizens would be wise to ponder these facts and check their residences. In addition, police can advise them on a number of ways to make their homes look occupied while they are away, particularly for extended periods.

Why make the pickings easier for these stealthy operators? You should at least make them work and worry before they make off with your valued possessions.

AGRICULTURE, AMERICA'S NO. 1 ASSET

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in our desire to respond to the pressing needs of dealing with our urban problems, we dare not neglect American agriculture which ranks near the top of American successes. Today, one farmworker produces enough agricultural products for himself and 44 other Americans. One hour of farm labor produces more than six times as much food as it did in 1919–21. The value of farm exports since World War II exceeds $100 billion, making the United States the largest exporter of foodstuffs of any country in the world.

But it is one of the ironies of success that the revolutionary triumph of American agriculture has accentuated the problems facing the industry, such as sustaining reasonable prices for commodities by correlating supply and demand, structural unemployment, unfortunate competition between large and small operators, and a host of other problems which plague agriculture. Failure to deal with these problems would not only be unfair to the American agriculture-related workers who number 5.1 million, but it would also endanger the economic well-being of the country. Congress certainly must not risk national prosperity by neglecting the largest national industry—American agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I insert into the RECORD at this point three articles in a series printed in the Willows Daily Journal which accurately illustrate the importance of agriculture in the United States:

FARMING IS VITAL TO THE ECONOMY

In this era of domestic unrest, the nation is focusing its attention upon the problems of big cities—upon poverty, slums and racism, and the rioting they breed.

These are properly matters for concern. Yet, unfortunately they have diverted attention from the snowballing problems besetting farmers. And to neglect the plight of the farmer means, in the long run, to undermine the economy: Agricultural prosperity is essential to national prosperity, as history records. Over a period of years agricultural depression stifles the nation's prosperity.

Isn't it time for the American public and its representatives in Congress to reassess the importance of agriculture to the nation as a whole?

Numerous facts about U.S. agriculture were brought out in a report by the Committee of Agriculture of the House of Representatives in May. In this and subsequent editorials they are summarized. They clarify agricultural's crucial role in the economy.

Farming is not only the nation's largest industry but the most progressive. Its pace of mechanization and progress in recent years has had no equal.

In size, U.S. agriculture employs 5.1 million workers—more than the employment in transportation, public utilities, the steel industry and the auto industry combined.

Its total assets of $298 billion equal about two-thirds of the value of current assets of all U.S. corporations, or about one-half the market value of all corporation stocks traded on the New York Stock Exchange.

The value of agriculture's production assets represents about $46,000 for each farm employee.

In modernization and efficiency no other segment of the economy comes close to agriculture's progress in the past half century.

One hour of farm labor produces more than six times as much food and other crops as it did in 1919–21. Per-acre crop production and output per breeding animal have doubled.

During the 1960's the output per man-hour by American farm workers soared at the rate of 6 per cent per year—double the rate of increase by non-agricultural workers.

One farm worker now produces food, fiber and other farm commodities for himself and 44 other Americans.

In addition the United States is the breadbasket of the world, being the world's largest exporter of farm products.

Of the nation's 300 million harvested acres 71 million acres are harvested for export. This represents about the same acreage as the total acreage devoted to crops in Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska and North Dakota.

In 1968 alone, $6.3 billion in farm products were exported, not only feeding millions of people overseas but producing a favorable trade balance for the United States. The value of U.S. farm exports since World War II exceeds $100 billion.

Is not this, then, a dominant segment of the American economy whose problems not only should, but must, concern the American public and its representatives in office?

FARMING A VITAL SEGMENT OF UNITED STATES

The farmer is among the nation's most important citizens—not only as a producer and exporter of food but also as a customer, taxpayer and creator of jobs.

This is brought out in facts about U.S. agriculture published in a May, 1969 report by the House Committee on Agriculture. They show beyond a shadow of doubt that the farmer's financial well-being is vital to the economic well-being of the nation.

As a good customer, the farmer spends more than $36 billion a year for goods and services to produce crops and livestock.

He spends an additional $12 billion a year for the same products that city people buy—food, clothing, drugs, furniture, appliances and others.

To boil down some of his major purchases, each year the farmer buys:

Over $4.9 billion in new farm tractors and other motor vehicles, machinery and equipment;

$3.9 billion for fuel, lubricants, and maintenance of machinery and motor vehicles, using more petroleum than any other single industry;

$2.1 billion for fertilizer and lime;

Products containing 320 million pounds of rubber—about 7 per cent of the total used in the United States, or enough to put tires on nearly 7 million autos;

32 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity—more than two and one-half per cent of the nation's total, or more than is consumed annually by Baltimore, Chicago, Boston, Detroit, Houston and Washington, D.C. combined.

Six and one-half million tons of steel in the form of farm machinery, trucks, cars, fencing and building materials. This is one-third as much steel as the entire automotive industry uses.

It is easy to see, then, that the failure of farming income to rise in proportion to that of other segments of the economy will, in the long run, cut into the sales of many U.S. industries.

Too few Americans—and especially legislators from the big cities—seem to realize that 3 of every 10 jobs in private employment are related to agriculture: that 8 million persons have jobs storing, transporting, processing and merchandising the products of agriculture; that 6 million persons have jobs providing the supplies farmers use.

Greater recognition should also be given to the fact that a tremendous burden of taxation at the national, state and local levels is borne by the farmer.

Last year U.S. farmers paid:

$2 billion in farm-property taxes;

One-third of a billion dollars in personal property taxes on farms;

$1.5 billion in federal and state income taxes;

$318 million in net taxes on motor fuels;

$180 million in motor vehicle license fees and taxes;

$350 million in sales taxes.

Doesn't the above all add up to the fact that the farmer is not only essential as producer of the food you eat and the clothes you wear, but also that he is an essential link in the U.S. economy's chain of prosperity? And a chain, after all, in the long run can be no stronger than its weakest link.

FARMS TURN OUT MANY PRODUCTS

Needless to say, the products of farm and ranch are essential to the well-being of Americans. These products are not limited to all-important food; they also include the necessities for clothing, shelter and a myriad of other products.

Concerning food, each American last year consumed these and other foods from U.S. farms and ranches:

183 pounds of beef, veal, pork, lamb and mutton;

45 pounds of chicken and turkey;

188 pounds of fruit or fresh-fruit equivalents;

238 pounds of vegetables or fresh-vegetable equivalents;

576 pounds of dairy products;

112 pounds of potatoes and 6 pounds of sweet potatoes or their fresh equivalents.

The American consumer can choose from as many as 6,000 different foods when he goes to the market—fresh, canned, frozen, concentrated, dehydrated, ready-mixed, ready to serve or in heat-and-serve form.

In no other nation do the consumers enjoy a fraction of the variety of choice; nor do they spend a lesser portion of their disposable income on food.

For clothing, too, American consumers are indebted to the products of U.S. farmers. In 1968 Americans used:

4.4 billion pounds of cotton, or nearly 22 pounds per person. That's the eqivalent of about 24 house dresses, or 35 dress shirts, for every man, woman and child in the nation.

480 million pounds of apparel and carpet wool, more than 2 pounds per person.

Furthermore, research has given these natural fibers new qualities. Specially treated cotton resists everything from wrinkles to fire, and wool can be treated to prevent shrinking when it is washed and to retain pleats in skirts and creases in trousers.

Perhaps too few consumers realize the importance of farmers in producing wood for homes and a myriad of other products. Three of every four forest owners are farmers, and they and other small woodland owners control 59 per cent of the nation's commercial forests. Timber is a crop, even though it takes one acre of healthy forest 20 years to grow enough lumber for a five-room frame house.

Many other products, too, are derived from the wood which farmers produce:

The average consumer uses about 512 pounds of paper per year. This requires a net annual wood growth from about three-fourths of an acre of commercial forest.

A single large New York newspaper uses the equivalent of net annual growth from 6,000 acres of commercial forest for its Sunday issue alone, or the net annual growth from 500,000 acres each year.

Other uses products from farmer-grown wood are foreseen. They include nitrocellulose, derived mainly from woodpulp and a major ingredient of some solid fuel propellants of rockets. The day of the wood-burning rocket may, then, soon arrive.

(What does the American consumer pay for his food and what does the farmer receive?)

TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR BY NORTH VIETNAM

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, our country and our brave servicemen held prisoners by North Vietnam have taken a courageous step. For the first time, our men who have been released by Hanoi are allowed to tell it like it is. The world should now be convinced more than ever before that North Vietnam has been barbarous in the treatment of American prisoners.

Mr. President, Lieut. Robert Franchot Frishman, who was released by Hanoi, has given the world the facts about the brutal treatment of our servicemen. Lieutenant Frishman said:

> I feel I am speaking not only for myself but for my buddies back in camp. I think it is time to get out the facts.

He added that his fellow prisoners still in captivity wanted the truth told about their treatment even if this would result in retaliatory beatings by their captors.

Mr. President, now that the world knows the truth about Hanoi's inhuman treatment of Americans, maximum U.S. and world pressure should be put on the Communists in Paris to release U.S. prisoners. This bold step should convince the Communists that we do not view the POW problem with passiveness. Our fighting men and our country believe that truth is more important than retaliation. If the Communists dare retaliation, then they should suffer severe consequences by necessary U.S. action.

Our men who are still held captive deserve the praise and commendation of our Nation for their courage and faith. We must not break this faith. Hanoi should be condemned by every nation for its brutality and for violating the Geneva Convention.

Mr. President, I am hopeful the administration will use every means available to secure the release of our brave fighting men. This new policy should be pursued with relentless effort. World opinion should be enlisted in behalf of civilized treatment of prisoners of war.

The Washington Post of September 3, 1969, published a story on the press conference given by Lieutenant Frishman and Postal Clerk 3C Douglas B. Hegdahl about the brutal treatment of our servicemen. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREED PRISONERS OF WAR TELL OF HANOI BRUTALITY, TORTURE

(By George C. Wilson)

Two American Navy men recently released from prison by Hanoi told of brutal treatment and torture of American prisoners as the Nixon administration yesterday tried a new tack to build up moral pressure against North Vietnam.

Lt. Robert Franchot Frishman, 28, and Postal Clerk 3C Douglas B. Hegdahl, 23, held the first press conference of its kind in the auditorium of the Bethesda Naval Hospital, where they have been recuperating from their ordeal.

Frishman, in a prepared statement he read in a steady voice to assembled reporters, said, "I feel I am speaking not only for myself but for my buddies back in the camp. I think it is time to get out the facts."

He added that his fellow prisoners still in captivity wanted the truth told about their treatment even if this would result in retaliatory beatings by their captors.

Hanoi has released only nine American prisoners since the Vietnam War began. The U.S. government policy until yesterday was to play down the experiences of the men released—apparently for fear of retaliation against those still held captive.

But administration officials in explaining yesterday's press conference said continued silence might be interpreted by Hanoi as government passiveness on the prisoner issue. They added that diplomatic efforts have failed to induce the North Vietnamese to treat their American prisoners better.

Frishman and Hegdahl were two of three men released Aug. 5. The third is Air Force Capt. Wesley L. Rumble, 26, of Oroville, Calif., who is recuperating at Travis Air Force Base.

Frishman has been spokesman for the three men since their release. He said upon landing in Vientiane, Laos, from Hanoi aboard an International Control Commission plane that "I do not want to jeopardize other prisoners still there. My treatment has been adequate."

His remarks yesterday about the treatment of Americans stood in sharp contrast to those earlier ones as he said the North Vietnamese pulled out fingernails, hung men from the ceiling, locked them in solitary confinement in stifling rooms and provided minimal food and medical care.

Taken prisoner after his F-4 fighter was shot down by a Communist surface-to-air missile Oct. 24, 1967, Frishman said the first thing his captors did was throw him into the back of a truck and parade him before anti-aircraft crews.

He said he was tied up and dragged, even though his right arm was broken from bailing out of the plane. The North Vietnamese questioned him about military tactics right after his capture, he said.

Unlike the North Koreans who kept beating and questioning the Pueblo crew until they signed confessions, Frishman said North Vietnamese interrogations eased after the initial ones about military matters.

The longest part of his captivity, he said, was spent in solitary confinement. Except for an occasional chance to sweep leaves, he said he spent his days eating two meals of little more than pumpkin soup and sitting in his 10-foot by 11-foot room trying to keep his mind active.

The room was closed off, he said, and had brick walls and a tin roof. The heat beating down on the roof turned his room "into an oven" so "you stayed in a heat rash all day."

"I still have a right arm," Frishman said in holding up a twisted limb without an elbow, "and I am grateful for that. It took six months to heal" because of inadequate medical care.

He described the misery of waking up morning after morning to find that his arm had bled during the night and was stuck fast to the blanket. This meant pulling off the scab to get his arm free, starting the bleeding all over again.

Lt. Cdr. Richard A. Stratton, also an American prisoner and still held by Hanoi, had it even worse, Frishman said. The North Vietnamese kept insisting that he tell visiting delegations that his treatment in captivity had been humane.

"This," Frishman said bitterly, "after he had had his fingernails removed and been thrown into a dark room." Pentagon records show that Stratton was captured Jan. 5, 1967.

Frishman praised Stratton for hitting Hanoi "right between the eyes" by deliberately acting, so stupified and brainwashed in a propaganda film that Western audiences could see through it.

"I feel I'm Stratton's best chance of getting the truth out," Frishman said. He added that Stratton had told him before he left that "if he gets tortured some more" because of Frishman's revelations, "at least he will know why."

"The higher-ups" in North Vietnam, Frishman said, "may not know" about the inhumane treatment—"I mean the generals." He said whenever generals visited the prison camp conditions improved.

Hegdahl said he was picked up by a North Vietnamese fisherman after falling off the USS Canberra on April 6, 1967. He said he does not know to this day how he fell overboard.

He, like Frishman was jailed in a camp in Hanoi. Hegdahl said he spent "seven months and 10 days" in solitary confinement. The daily routine, he said, was arise at 5 a.m.; dump the waste bucket in the room; listen to "Hanoi Hannah" on the North Vietnamese radio a good part of the morning; eat the first meal at 10 a.m. and the last one at 4 p.m. The captors gave him three cigarettes a day. There was nothing to do except lie in bed or sit in a chair and try to think of something, he said.

The prison compound, Frishman said, had several one-story buildings with a barbed wire fence around it. Guards patroled the perimeter.

Frishman said he knew he was going to be released when his captors called him over to what the Americans called "The Big House," evidently the administration building in the prison compound. There, he said, the North Vietnamese had spread out delicious foods for him to eat.

The North Vietnamese tried to restore some of the 50 pounds he had lost in captivity, Frishman said, before releasing him. Asked why he was chosen for release, Frishman said he figured because he was wounded and required care.

Hegdahl theorized that his release stemmed from the fact that "I'm only a seaman."

About the only real morale booster came when American bombs hitting Hanoi caused the buildings in the compound to shake, Frishman said. With blistering heat in the summer and chilling cold in the winter, plus his wounds, "I had a hell of a time."

The Pentagon estimates that there are about 1,325 Americans who are missing or imprisoned by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong.

RETALIATORY ACTION

Richard G. Capen Jr., public affairs officer dealing with prisoner problems for the Defense Department, was asked about the possibility that the press conference might subject the Americans still in captivity to retaliatory action by Hanoi. He said he is hopeful instead that Hanoi will be encouraged to treat its prisoners humanely in accord with the Geneva Convention.

Capen said the two Navy men had a "very strong desire to speak out, and we did not interfere." As for risks, he said Americans in captivity are already heavily exposed to them.

PROMISING REORGANIZATION OF OEO

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's recent restructuring of the Office of Economic Opportunity promises to make that agency more effective and more innovative as well. It creates a stronger vehicle for development of effective new techniques for removing people from poverty. Secondly, it streamlines the agency's management and separates its functions so as to make it more responsive to local and regional needs. By tightening the lines of administration and by separating sometimes conflicting functions, I think the President has indicated he intends to make more creative use of the OEO—both as innovator and as operator of programs.

I think its new Director, Donald Rumsfeld, ought to be commended for his imaginative work in planning the agency's future. He has worked hard to analyze its strengths and weaknesses and to shape a new direction in the program that would best serve the interests of the poor.

Innovation is the mission of a new program development arm. And its pragmatic approach looks most promising. This would begin with the isolation of needs, and proceed to the design of experimental programs, then to the operation of worthwhile pilot projects, and finally the elevation of successful experiments to full-scale operations.

Too often in the past, programs have tended to interfere with research, and advocacy has tended to thwart objective evaluation. Now experimentation will have the independence it deserves. The fact that OEO develops a successful innovation does not necessarily mean it will operate the full-scale program itself. There are several possibilities. It might be appropriate for private industry or another Government agency to run the new program. That would depend on who could do it best.

On the management side, some 20 to 30 officials were reporting to the Director under the old organizational structure. This has been reduced sharply to a more manageable number. Regional directors, rather than reporting to the Director, will report to an Assistant Director for Operations. The Office of Operations will provide greater support to the regional offices. More money will be spent to provide management support—including training and technical assistance—to local community action agencies and other OEO-funded agencies. There will be more careful scrutiny of grant applications and a closer monitoring of grants that have been made. All these should improve the ability of local agencies to better control antipoverty funds they receive.

It seems clear that the administration has devised a purposeful and relevant new thrust for the Federal poverty program.

WASHINGTON WORKSHOPS: A LESSON IN COMMUNICATION

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity of meeting and talking with some 150 high school students from all across the country. They are here to study firsthand the U.S. Congress and they are participating in an imaginative program called the Washington workshops.

This summer the Washington Workshops Foundation, a private nonprofit educational organization, sponsored congressional seminars for nearly 1,000 students from every part of the country and from every socioeconomic background. Many of the students participated in the workshops with scholarship assistance from local businesses, community civic organizations, and the Washington Workshops Foundation.

The Washington workshops were established in 1968 to offer the Nation's young people the chance to study and see their Government in action, and to communicate with the elected leaders with whom their future has been entrusted. I can confirm that these purposes are indeed being fulfilled by the Washington workshops.

These young people, who soon will be the students and leaders on our college campuses, have a lot of questions to ask concerning the direction in which this country is going—the country which they will inherit to lead not too many years hence. Their questions, like the students who pose them, are aware and concerned. They challenge myths and they demand honesty. They are filled with frustration, but hope as well. They will not be answered by easy excuses or tired resolve.

But America's young people also want to listen, to learn. More than 50 Congressmen and Senators of every political persuasion met with the Washington workshops students. The students disagreed with many of their elected representatives, but they did not walk out. They conversed and attempted to communicate why they thought differently about the country and its problems and priorities.

The Washington workshops offer a tremendous opportunity, then, for the Nation's young people—and its leaders—to converse, to talk with one another about where our country is going and—more important—where it should go. This is an opportunity for which I and my colleagues in this House are grateful. The Washington workshops is offering something that is vitally important and needed today—a living lesson in communication.

SPECIAL PAY BENEFITS FOR OPTOMETRY OFFICERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation that would authorize additional pay benefits of $100 per month to optometry officers on active duty in the uniformed services.

Optometrists are drafted into the services, Army, Navy, and Air Force, under the doctor's draft provisions of the Military Selective Service Act, as are medical doctors, osteopaths, dentists, and veterinarians.

Optometry students are deferred under rulings of the President, the National Security Council, and the Selective Service System to complete their professional education, as are medical doctors, osteopaths, dentists, and veterinarians.

Optometrists are recognized for their military coding definition as having doctorate degrees, as are these other four professions of the health care team.

Optometrists receive constructive service credit for their years of professional education above the normal 4-year college baccalaureate as do the others.

However, the optometry officer does not receive any special pay benefits as do all the aforementioned four health care representatives in the services.

The some 600 optometry officers on active duty in the uniformed services are furnishing the majority of the vision care to literally millions of eligibles, from the serviceman to his dependents.

This bill would be an incentive to optometry officers to make a career out of the service and raise the retention rate that has reached a critical alltime low. Considering the fact that almost 50 percent of the military personnel are wearing some type of visual aid, it is urgent that recruitment and retention of optometry officers be increased.

Mr. Speaker, in order to provide justifiable inducements to optometrists, I introduce this legislation which would give a measure of equality with the other health professions and, I am certain, increase the retention rate.

I, along with other of my colleagues, was concerned over the need for this legislation in the 90th Congress and introduced an identical bill (H.R. 10543) to the one I am introducing today.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point a resolution endorsing this legislation, passed by the House of Delegates of the American Optometric Association at their 72d annual meeting in Philadelphia earlier this month:

RESOLUTION 3A

Whereas, our servicemen and servicewomen, and their dependents, require and deserve the highest quality vision care; and

Whereas, modern technological advances have placed increasingly greater demands on human vision; and

Whereas, the alarmingly low retention rate of optometry officers in the Armed Forces is causing a critical shortage of career optometry officer leaders; and this low retention rate is excessively costly to the Government in man-hours and money; and

Whereas, optometry is the only health care profession whose students are deferred and whose graduates are subject to call into the Service under the Doctor's Draft Law and who do not receive incentive pay consideration; now therefore be it

Resolved, that the American Optometric Association supports and urges early adoption of legislation by the Congress which would provide incentive pay benefits for optometry officers on active duty in the uniformed services.

Adopted by the 72nd House of Delegates on July 12, 1969.

SALUTE TO SINGAPORE

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, August 9 marked the end of another year of independence for a tiny Asian island—27 miles wide and 14 miles long—which has the admirable distinction of being the fourth largest port in the world. I am speaking of Singapore and, with all due respect and regard, I rise to salute our fast-growing friend and to commemorate this, their fourth anniversary of independence.

Singapore's economy can easily be described: success. Characterized by all-around growth, the economy can boast a 7.7-percent increase in gross domestic expenditure for 1968 over 1967, an increase in total investment by 17 percent last year, and the addition of 47 more manufacturing firms during 1968. Needless to say, a great deal of attention is placed on the shipping industry. As early as 1964, Singapore wisely foresaw what an important role she could play in this industry, and greatly expanded her role in shipping, as the current earnings of $34 million per year would indicate. Moreover, plans are in the works to equip facilities to repair large oceangoing vessels. By the 1970's their largest shipyard will be able to build vessels up to 70,000 tons, as well as naval patrol boats and oceangoing freighters.

Much of the credit for such an encouraging outlook rightly belongs to the Prime Minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew. Blessed with a persuasive personality in perfect combination with a nimble mind, he skillfully avoids demagoguery. From the beginning of his administration, one can see how he has deftly handled a number of problems—from taxes fairly levied to fill a depleted treasury and money properly spent with emphasis on the welfare of the citizenry—Singapore incidentally claims one of the highest standards of living in Asia—to the recent Economic Expansion Act, which provides incentives for even more investment and exports—and his reputation both at home and abroad is easily explained.

Furthermore, considering the rise of American investment in Singapore and the active cooperation between that nation and Indonesia, surely it can be said that Singapore is working for the good of all. As a respected member of the world community and a thriving nation of ambitious and proud people, Singapore we salute you.

THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INVASION OF POLAND

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, September 1, 1969, marked the 30th anniversary of the invasion of Poland by Nazi Germany. On that tragic day in 1939 Hitler's military might was thrown against Poland's western frontier, and 16 days later the Soviets became accomplices of the Germans when they invaded Poland from the east.

The tragedy stunned the rest of the world—a world slumbering in optimism and appeasement—and World War II, the holocaust which followed for the next 5 years, might have at least been diminished in destructiveness had the world foreseen the ineffectiveness of appeasing aggressors.

Unaided and unprepared, the Polish people fought courageously against the invaders but succumbed in a matter of days both from the enormity of Hitler's military machine on the west and the pressure of the Soviet forces on the east.

The Polish people were among those who suffered the most from the inhumanity of World War II—not only did they lose approximately 6 million of their population, but they have continued to pay in their loss of freedom and individual rights under the postwar Soviet regime. Warsaw and other major Polish cities were almost 70 percent destroyed and more than one-fourth of the homes in Poland were demolished.

Following the end of the war, after the German troops were expelled, the only foreign troops left in Poland were those from the Soviet Union. The Soviets, therefore, had little difficulty in establishing a Communist-dominated government by relying on the coercive presence of their military forces.

The brutal techniques of coercion used by the Soviet Union to subdue the Polish population were similar to those used to subordinate other East European nations—mass killings, deportations, and severe deprivations. The indomitable Polish spirit, however, has not been crushed. It has remained steadfast and has demonstrated itself time and again, as evidenced in particular by the Poznan uprising in 1956.

What the ultimate destiny of Poland will be, however, no one can tell, for communism still maintains a firm and steady grip over the country. Therefore, on this anniversary of the invasion of Poland and the beginning of World War II, our hearts go out to the Polish people.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak not only for myself but for many of my colleagues when I express the hope that the Polish people may one day be fully rewarded for the heroism and patriotism they have demonstrated since that fateful day—September 1, 1939.

As the Representative for the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, where hundreds of thousands of Polish-Americans reside, I speak with pride and appreciation for the outstanding contribution they have made to the growth and development of our great country.

And today, as we in the House of Representatives observe this significant anniversary, we look forward to the day when the fearless, hard-working, and courageous Poles shall once again join the community of free nations and shall enjoy fully the fruits of democracy, liberty, and self-determination which they so richly deserve.

TOM ABERNETHY DAY

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, August 23, the people of the First Congressional District of Mississippi and really the people of the entire State paid tribute to one of our most outstanding colleagues, THOMAS GERSTLE ABERNETHY. On this day in Eupora, Miss., TOM ABERNETHY was honored with his own special day in recognition of his 27 years of service in the U.S. House of Representatives. I was very pleased that many, many of his colleagues sent TOM letters and telegrams of congratulations. These messages were deeply appreciated by TOM, his wife Alice, and their children. The letters and telegrams will be bound for safekeeping. Since I know many of you will be interested in the proceedings on TOM ABERNETHY Day, I would like to include the following article taken from the Tupelo Daily Journal, Tupelo, Miss., of August 25, 1969:

TOM ABERNETHY DAY

(By Mary Jo Latham)

EUPORA, MISS.—A 27-year-old Congressman who recited a poem about "riding away to Washington" when he was six years old was honored here Saturday by residents of his hometown and the First Congressional District.

Rep. Thomas G. Abernethy (D., Miss.) was praised by speakers including Okolona Mayor Dwight F. Blissard and Eupora Mayor Phillip Harrison, Congressional colleagues and President Richard M. Nixon who sent congratulations from "one who had the pleasure of serving with you in the Congress over many years."

About 1,200 persons jammed a tree-lined grove about a mile south of this small Webster County town—where banners across the main streets proclaimed their welcome to Eupora's native son.

Mr. Abernethy sat with his family—wife Alice, daughter Gail and her husband Arthur Doty, and Mr. and Mrs. Thomas G. Abernethy, III and others—on the bunting-draped platform and listened to the speeches.

Then it was his turn. In a husky voice, the long-time lawmaker said, "I don't deserve all that's been said about me here today. I mean it."

"I don't deserve the glory of this day. And I mean it. But I tell you, I appreciate it and I'm going to remember it when I've forgotten all else."

He recalled his boyhood in Eupora when "I came across the stage riding a stick horse and recited: 'I'm riding away to Washington, As fast as may be; If you've a message for the President, Just send it along with me'."

"That may have had something to do with my decision to run for Congress," Mr. Abernethy said.

He spoke also of the changes in rural life during his 27 years in Washington and added, "I'm not claiming credit for those changes, but I am claiming credit for having participated in them."

Mr. Abernethy was introduced by his sixth grade teacher, Miss Mary Billy Miles, who said she saw then he was "a man of loyalty to friends and principle, a man with courage to express those views in a very difficult situation."

The speakers—representing more than 200 years of public service—included Senator John C. Stennis who praised the Congressman's "vigor—he stays on the job and works" and added, "When a person goes to the Congress, he either grows or he swells. Tom Abernethy has not swollen—he has grown year by year."

Senator James O. Eastland singled out Mr. Abernethy as "one of the most effective members in the Congress. For the past twenty years, he has authored or had a hand in passing every single farm program. I think Tom Abernethy is necessary for Mississippi's future."

United States 5th Circuit Court Judge J. P. Coleman, a former governor, recalled the four years he worked "as a hired hand" for Mr. Abernethy and said, "The one descriptive word (for the Congressman) would be service."

House colleagues including Representatives Charles Griffin, G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery and Jamie Whitten also praised Mr. Abernethy for his work along with State Agriculture Commissioner Jim Buck Ross and Hollis R. Williams of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Whitten commented Mr. Abernethy's family—"are not only a credit to him, they are a help to him"—and added "They say a man's works live on after him. Surely its nice to say thank you while he's here to enjoy it."

Mr. Williams spoke of the Congressman's work in soil and water conservation, flood prevention and flood control and quoted a letter from Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin praising Mr. Abernethy for contributing "significantly to the re-vitalization of rural America."

Mr. Ross praised his interest in agriculture and agricultural research. "He has championed every bill that has come up on research."

Gov. John Bell Williams and Rep. William Colmer were unable to attend because of commitments on the hurricane-ravaged Gulf Coast but sent telegrams of congratulations.

EXCELLENT ADDRESS ON TAX REFORMS BY EDWIN S. COHEN, TREASURY'S ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR TAX POLICY

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, since the first of the year, the members of the Ways and Means Committee gave unstintingly of their time and effort in developing the tax reform bill of 1969. House approval of the final measure was overwhelming, and I think that each of us who worked on the bill took some personal satisfaction from the decisiveness of the vote.

But it should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that through the long days of testimony, debate, research, and drafting, the committee members enjoyed the selfless and expert assistance of two extraordinary men.

One was Laurence N. Woodworth, chief of staff to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. His amazing knowledge of tax issues kept us clear of many pitfalls and allowed us to see clearly and quickly the probable consequences of the many proposals before us.

The other was Edwin S. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy. He was unflaggingly helpful and cooperative, and his informed dedication to genuine tax reform was an inspiration to the committee.

On August 9, Mr. Cohen spoke to the members of the American Bar Association's section of taxation during its annual meeting in Dallas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cohen's penetrating analysis of the tax reform bill is excellent. I believe it would be of interest to my colleagues in the House, and I insert his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE EDWIN S. COHEN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR TAX POLICY, AT THE SECTION OF TAXATION LUNCHEON, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION ANNUAL LUNCHEON, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING, SHERATON-DALLAS HOTEL, DALLAS, TEX., SATURDAY, AUGUST 9, 1969

It gives me great pleasure to appear before the Section of Taxation today to report to you about the activities of the Treasury Department for the past few months in the development of the Tax Reform Act of 1969, which passed the House of Representatives two days ago.

I do so with a nostalgic recollection that a dozen years ago in this city I appeared before this Section for the first time as a committee chairman to urge adoption of legislative recommendations for changes in the corporate income tax field. I hope that by the time we meet again next August, I can report to you that at least some of those recommendations, and others that you have developed and adopted for the improvement of the law, have either become law, or are well on their way to enactment.

I took office on March 11. John Nolan joined us as my Deputy on April 1 and Meade Whitaker as Tax Legislative Counsel on July 1. As you well know from their years of work in this Section, they are most able and dedicated men, and their intelligence and devotion to the task made it possible for the Treasury to respond when the long awaited hour of tax reform was finally at hand.

We presented the Administration's initial, or interim, proposals for tax reform to the Committee on Ways and Means in public session on April 22–24. We stated then that we would formulate additional proposals in specific areas as soon as time permitted. We have been engaged ever since in the development of additional proposals while appearing in almost daily executive sessions of the Committee.

These additional views have been presented to the Committee informally as it took up for consideration the many topics that were dealt with in the public hearings earlier this year, but they have not yet taken shape as official Administration positions. We do hope that in our public appearance on the bill before the Senate Finance Committee we shall be able to express the Treasury's position on each of the significant areas dealt with in the bill.

As you know, the staff of the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation both appear before the Committee on Ways and Means in its executive sessions. Dr. Laurence N. Woodworth, the distinguished Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee, and I, together with our colleagues on both staffs, spent many long hours together in reviewing the many problem areas under consideration by the Committee and endeavoring to produce a recommendation to the Committee on which we could jointly agree. The opportunity to work with Dr. Woodworth in these matters was one of the most enjoyable and pleasant experiences of my career at the Bar. I am confident that those of you who know Dr. Woodworth will appreciate why this was so. I am happy to report that time after time we were able, after discussion, to reconcile our views so as to collaborate in a final recommendation to the Committee.

The almost daily sessions before the Committee were always interesting, and the questions asked by the Committee members were penetrating and significant. Both the chairman, Mr. Mills, and the ranking Republican member, Mr. Byrnes, constantly displayed a mastery of the intricacies of the tax law. Their wealth of experience in the field is a major source of strength to the Committee—and even more important—to the country. The debates were vigorous, and it was particularly gratifying to see that the subject of tax reform was approached in an essentially nonpartisan atmosphere. I cannot recall a single vote which was taken on party lines. While there was necessarily division of opinion on many specific important issues, the effort to achieve tax reform was clearly a bi-partisan one, and I believe it will continue to be so in the Senate.

I think the Tax Reform Bill provides major improvements in the tax structure. The Low Income Allowance, which we proposed in April, will at a cost of only $625 million—less than one percent of the individual income tax revenue—remove from the tax rolls virtually all persons who are below the poverty level standards set by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This means that some five million income tax returns, which would presently require payment of a tax, will be made wholly untaxable, and some 7 million additional returns in the low income group will bear a reduced rate.

There is one aspect of this proposal which may not have received adequate public attention. In raising to $1,700 the amount of income which a single person must have before he is subject to federal income tax, we will have given a particularly significant aid to students working their way through college, for they now bear a tax of $117 at that level. Since their parents may also retain the $600 personal exemption for the student, a total of $2,300 of income for a working student can be freed of taxation.

Under the bill as passed a further liberalization of the low income allowance in 1971 will enlarge its benefits further up the scale in the low income groups.

The enlargement of the standard deduction in three stages to raise it from 10 percent to 15 percent and to raise the standard deduction ceiling from $1,000 to $2,000 will provide a major simplification for some 12 million tax returns that now itemize personal deductions. Henceforth all those returns can be filed on the simplified form. At present almost 32 million of the 76 million returns itemize deductions. Thus we are reducing by more than one-third the number of returns that itemize personal deductions.

The bill gives head of household treatment to all single persons over 35 and to widows and widowers of any age. While the principal complaints of single persons under existing law have been with those of individuals who maintain their own household, the difficulty of identifying a household in the case of single persons resulted in the decision to give this benefit to all single persons over 35, particularly since the additional revenue difference was relatively small. Moreover, widows and widowers maintaining households with minor children or with children in college will be allowed to use the joint return rates of tax without regard to the two-year limitation in existing law.

Another innovation in the bill is the topping off of the rates on earned income at the 50 percent level. Many of the devices for conversion of ordinary income into capital gain, and for deferment of income, have been nurtured out of the natural desire of persons who have reached high earned income levels to avoid the burden of very high rates. This they have attempted through participation in ventures that produce current deductions and subsequent capital gains, or in artificial transactions that defer the receipt of income. For example, a man whose earnings reach the 70 percent level is in essence risking only 30 percent of his own money and 70 percent in tax money when he enters into these ventures. By reducing the maximum rate on earned income to 50 percent, such a person will be risking his own money to the same extent that he is risking the tax money, thus significantly reducing the present tendency toward artificial transactions. The successful executive or professional man will be more inclined to concentrate his efforts in the fields in which he is qualified and devote less of his attention to intricate means of minimizing the effect of high tax rates. We think the 50 percent top marginal rate on earned income represents a substantial improvement in the law, particularly when coupled with the many provisions which eliminate or curb existing tax avoidance techniques.

Since the effect of the low income allowance and the increased standard deduction will reduce taxes in the low and middle income brackets, the bill as reported by the Committee provided rate reduction in the brackets starting at $4,000 for single persons and $8,000 for married persons, topping off at a rate of 65 percent instead of the present 70 percent.

The bill removes the 25 percent ceiling rate on long-term capital gains, thus permitting the tax on capital gains to rise to a maximum of 32½ percent (one-half of 65 percent), since one-half of such gains will be taken into income, as under present law. However, under the new rate schedule the effective tax rate on long-term capital gains will not exceed the present 25 percent for a married person until taxable income exceeds $76,000.

It is interesting to note the difference that the tax rate structure in the new bill would have on stock option plans or other programs for producing capital gains rather than earned income. At present an executive can pay tax at a rate up to 70 percent on compensation, but pays only 25 percent on capital gains under some of the stock option plans or restricted stock plans. That represents a spread of 45 points between 25 percent and 70 percent. Under the bill he would pay up to 32½ percent on capital gains but no more than 50 percent on earned income, a spread of only 17½ points. Such changes might have a material impact on executive compensation arrangements.

By Committee amendment after the bill was reported, a further rate reduction in the lower and middle income brackets was given in order to provide a minimum of 5 percent reduction to all taxpayers in the lower and middle income brackets, whether the taxpayer itemizes his deduction or uses the standard deduction. The result is to give a reduction of more than 5 percent to those using the standard deduction and to produce a $2.4 billion loss in revenue in what was, broadly speaking, a reasonably balanced package from a revenue standpoint when the bill was first reported. This revenue loss will have to be considered carefully in the light of the budgetary needs for 1971 and subsequent years.

Another factor that deserves some consideration is the reallocation of the tax burden between corporations and individuals. The largest revenue increase comes from the repeal of the investment credit and other changes which bear more heavily upon corporations. More than $5 billion of the additional revenue raised by the bill will come from corporations and only about $1.3 billion from individuals, almost entirely in the high income brackets. All of the tax reductions are being given in the individual sector and no rate reduction is provided for corporations. Many economists may feel this involves too great an allocation of benefits to consumption and not enough to investment in productive equipment and capacity. Some corporate rate reduction might be useful in the long run, particularly in permitting our American businesses to compete overseas through export operations.

In our public presentation in April, we recommended that the ability of some high bracket individuals to escape completely the sharing of the burden of government be restricted by imposing a limit on Tax Preferences and by requiring allocations of their nonbusiness deductions between their taxable income and their nontaxable income. The Limit on Tax Preferences (or LTP) recognized the fact that the income tax contains preferences designed to stimulate investment in paricular fields deemed especially important as a matter of national policy; but at the same time it recognized that once these preferences are written into the law, they may be used separately or in combination by some individuals so as to avoid completely year after year any obligation to share the tax burden of maintaining the operations of the Federal Government.

The Limit on Tax Preferences seeks to overcome this dilemma, without destroying the preferences, by limiting the use of these provisions in any year to one-half of the taxpayers' income calculated without regard to the preferences. A reasonable balance thus is struck between the advantages to the nation in stimulating investments of certain types and the need for insuring a fair distribution of the Federal tax burden.

The Bill adopts this approach, but in a decision near the end of its deliberations the Committee deleted from the list of preferences percentage depletion in excess of cost and intangible drilling expenses. Certainly one of the important reasons for this deletion was the fact that the Committee had previously voted to reduce percentage depletion on oil and gas from 27½ percent to 20 percent, as well as certain other changes with respect to minerals, and thought it best not to take further restrictive action at this time. Whatever the merit of the other actions taken with respect to minerals, the deletion of percentage depletion and intangible drilling expense from the list of preferences will make it possible for certain individuals engaging in extensive oil operations to continue to eliminate all income tax, despite the continuing receipt of net economic income, through the incentives given in the law to the mineral industry. Even if the Bill as finally enacted reduces the percentage depletion below 27½ percent, these persons will still be able to eliminate income tax entirely if they increase somewhat their expenditures on drilling, whether on discovery wells or development wells, and even though the drilling produces successful wells.

I listened patiently to the complaints of many that the Limit on Tax Preferences, if it encompassed depletion and intangibles, would substantially mark the end of drilling operations by independent oil operators. I have asked each of these persons to suggest some reasonable alternative that would not seriously affect the industry, but would give to other taxpayers a reasonable assurance that everyone who is prospering from his business shares in the Federal income tax burden to some reasonable extent. We would welcome any suggestions or thoughts that would provide a reasonable solution to the problem. We are not necessarily wedded to any particular formula, but we remain inclined to believe that the Limit on Tax Preferences, with percentage depletion and intangible drilling cost included among the list of preferences, is a reasonable approach.

Aside from the Limit on Tax Preferences and the allocation of production proposals, we have been searching in these last few months for a logical national policy related to taxation of income from natural resources. The natural resources income tax problem is as complex as any in the Internal Revenue Code, and it is not solved, in my judgment at least, by slicing 27½ percent to some lower number.

One of the principal arguments in favor of percentage depletion after the cost of investment has been fully recovered is that it is needed as an incentive in development of our natural resources. If this is true, and I am inclined to think it is true, then we might perhaps insist that the incentive be given only to the extent that the untaxed depletion amounts are plowed back into the development of our natural resources—by further exploration and development of oil and gas wells or of any other natural resources (including timber) or research or development of methods of discovery, recovery or utilization of natural resources from their unprocessed form. Under this concept, qualifying plow-back expenditures would be limited to domestic resources except, under certain conditions, with respect to minerals that are scarce or nonexistent in the United States.

As part of this suggestion intangible drilling costs of successful wells would be deductible with respect to exploration wells but would be required to be capitalized with respect to development wells and amortized as deductions over some specific period no longer than ten years, in addition to the allowance for percentage depletion. Moreover, geological and geophysical expenditures, now required to be capitalized and in effect now lost as deductions, would be allowed.

I emphasize that this is merely one possibility which we have under consideration. In our considerations we would like to insure that that nation gets its money's worth from the tax incentives given, here as well as elsewhere in the tax law.

The Treasury also has put much effort in the past few months in the development of an appropriate tax policy with respect to real estate, beyond the inclusion of excess accelerated depreciation in our Limit on Tax Preferences and allocations of deductions. The Bill passed by the House embodies, in general, most of the conclusions to which we came.

Our study of the real estate problem convinced us that double declining balance depreciation produces an excessive allowance for real estate construction generally, and that the allowance should be no greater than 150 percent declining balance. Nevertheless, with respect to housing, the goal of 26 million housing units within the next decade, set by the Housing Act of 1968, requires some incentives to fill this national need. Important provisions in the Housing Act of 1968 relating to the construction of low and middle income multi-family housing, were built upon the existing income tax incentives, including double declining balance depreciation.

We concluded, therefore, that the double declining balance depreciation should be allowed to remain in the present tax structure with respect to new housing construction, at least until Congress has an opportunity to review the housing program at some future date.

With respect to real estate in the hands of second and subsequent owners, the Bill confines depreciation to straight line. At the same time in order to stimulate the rehabilitation of used housing, it allows five-year amortization of expenditures for the rehabilitation of low-cost rental housing. We believe that these provisions in combination make it less attractive to acquire and hold old housing for the depreciation benefits and more attractive to rehabilitate them into modern desirable housing units.

While further changes in the real estate provisions may still be in order, we believe that the present provisions of the Bill in this regard move in the direction of sound policy.

There has been much interest in the changes that are proposed with respect to contributions to charitable and educational organizations, particularly with respect to contributions of appreciated property. The fact that charitable contributions are deductible on income tax returns has provided a major incentive for private support of public charities and educational organizations in the United States. The Treasury Department earnestly supports the continuation of that policy. At the same time it is clear that some abuses and excesses in the charitable contribution field have developed in which the loss in revenue to the Treasury and the inequity resulting in the tax structure outweigh, in our judgment, the advantages derived by the recipient organizations.

We felt, for example, that the time had come to cut down on the unlimited charitable contribution deduction which relieved a number of wealthy individuals from all income tax obligations. We thought that the privilege of deducting the full market value of property which has appreciated in value but which, if sold, would produce ordinary income, was excessive; but we were inclined to retain the rule with respect to property that, if sold, would produce capital gains. Excessive use of contributions of appreciated property as a means of tax minimization is controlled adequately through inclusion of such transactions in the limit on Tax Preferences and the Allocation of Deductions. I am pleased that the Committee has, in general, followed this course of action with respect to contributions to public organizations and also to private foundations which funnel the amounts to public use.

At the same time that the bill moves to close off some abuses in the contribution area, the bill adopts the Treasury recommendation to increase the allowable charitable contribution from 30 percent to 50 percent of the donor's adjusted gross income, although it does not permit this additional 20 percent to be given in the form of appreciated property.

Taking all of the changes into account, we estimate that there will be a revenue increase to the Treasury in the contribution area, including the effect of the Limit on Tax Preferences and the Allocation of Deductions, in the neighborhood of $100 million. On the other hand, we estimate that because of adoption of a rule we recommended to require private foundations to distribute to public charity not less than five percent per annum of the value of their assets, there will be an increase in funds flowing out of private foundations into public charitable and educational organizations on the order of $200 million. Accordingly, we believe that there will be a net increase in funds flowing into public charitable and educational organizations.

It is interesting to note that, according to our best estimates, some $15 billion a year flows by contributions of various kinds into public charitable and educational organizations, including transfers from corporations and from bequests, as well as from lifetime giving. Our statistical data taken from 1966 income tax returns show that some $9 billion of contributions were deducted on individual income tax returns. Of that amount about $8.3 billion, or about 92 percent, was contributed in cash. Only about 8 percent, or some $760 million, was contributed in the form of appreciated property. By permitting the continuation of deductions of the full value of appreciated capital assets given to public charitable and educational organizations, we believe there will be no significant reductions in contributions from individuals; and the pressure applied to private foundations to cause a reasonable return on their investments to flow into public channels will actually increase the funds available to our public charitable and educational institutions.

There are, of course, many other provisions in this 368-page bill. I have touched only on a few significant areas. As Secretary Kennedy wrote to Chairman Mills, "We believe that the bill is a milestone in tax legislation and will be long remembered as a major advance in achieving an equitable tax structure."

Of course, the bill will have substantial analysis and consideration before the Senate Finance Committee. Again let me say that we earnestly solicit your comments, criticisms and suggestions for improvement of the bill. The Section of Taxation has been a great help in the past in assisting the Treasury and the Congressional staffs, and I look forward to hearing the views of the members on the Reform Bill.

DEMANDS ACTION ON POW AND MIA

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, in the Fourth District of Florida which I represent, the people are deeply concerned over the plight of the prisoners of war and the soldiers missing in action, as a result of the war in Vietnam. I share this concern and feel congressional demands on the administration to take action in these men's behalf are in order.

In the State of Florida, some 81 families sit waiting for word so they will know if a loved one is even still alive. Many of these families believe their men are prisoners of war, but failure of the North Vietnamese to release names of prisoners as provided by the Geneva Convention, offers no assurance for this belief. Knowledge of the ill treatment of these prisoners by marching many through the streets, neglecting them medically, refusing Red Cross inspection, and allowing no mail exchanges, has become an intolerable burden for these families to live with and a totally abysmal situation for members of our armed services.

There is intense and rising emotion about this matter in my district, both on the part of those families with members who are prisoners or missing in action, and on the part of many others who recognize the inhumanity of such treatment.

I urge the administration to consider these men in their negotiation with the North Vietnamese. Nationwide, there are over 1,300 men now listed as prisoners of war or as missing in action. A complete list of their names and a plan for their release must be an integral part of the war settlement.

A SALUTE TO TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, August 31 marked the seventh anniversary of Trinidad and Tobago's independence. As we in the United States add our congratulations to the people of these thriving West Indian islands, we are struck by the remarkable progress which they have made in the short period since independence was attained in 1962.

Great strides have been made in both the political and economic spheres. The joint government of the two islands has demonstrated a determination to assert its autonomy and to evolve as the unified and responsive political instrument of all its citizens. Under the able leadership of Prime Minister Eric Williams, a one-time Washington resident and Howard University professor, the cabinet and legislature have provided the major impetus for the continuing economic and social development of Trinidad and Tobago.

The economy of the two islands is thriving as never before. Trinidad's standard of living, now the highest in the West Indies, has been increasing at a fairly steady rate since independence. The production of crude oil, which is the backbone of Trinidad and Tobago's economy, reached a new peak of 67 million barrels in 1968.

Acknowledging the inherent uncertainty in petroleum-based economies as to the extent of potential oil reserves, the islands' far-sighted government has already taken steps to diversify the economy. Wisely distributing its "eggs" among many "baskets," Trinidad and Tobago are actively encouraging new investment in manufacturing, food processing, commercial fishing, as well as in urban renewal and other construction projects. Tourism is also on the rise in these beautiful islands, encouraging considerable foreign investment in resort facilities.

While the islands' political institutions and commercial enterprises have become increasingly sophisticated since independence, these progressive steps toward modernization have not been made at the expense of the unique culture indigenous to Trinidad and Tobago. The 1 million inhabitants of these islands are descendants of a rich variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds whose society has developed as a distinctive and harmonious blend of other cultures. Indeed, a citizen of the country—or his ancestor—may have come from Ireland, Portugal, Lebanon, China, India, Pakistan, East or West Africa, France, Spain, or England, and a full 10 percent of the population hails from other Caribbean lands.

The citizenship of Trinidad and Tobago represents an unusual fusion of diverse peoples whose distinctive cultural traits are not obliterated, but rather are enhanced, in the peaceful integration process. Kenneth Ablack, public relations officer to the Prime Minister, aptly characterized his unusual homeland when he said:

> We are, in fact, what I would describe as an inter-racial—not a multi-racial—society, with a unique, distinct ability to live together.

Harmony arising from diversity is, then, the cornerstone of Trinidad and Tobago's social and economic success since independence. Democracy has proven itself in this unique island community as the type of government most conducive to citizen participation and cooperation. These dedicated citizens have achieved unity through the solid political foundations of representative government and through the common determination to see their nation prosper economically. Dr. William expressed this spirit of cooperation best when he wrote in March 1967, that—

> As a sovereign nation we have succeeded in building a truly democratic society in which our population, drawn from many racial strips and religious persuasions, enjoys equal opportunity and freedom consistent with the widest interpretation of human rights and human dignity. We see our role in the world as that of setting an example of freedom and interracialism.

As we salute the past achievements and future aspirations of those extraordinary island republics, we add our hope that the atmosphere of peace and prosperity will continue to prevail in Trinidad and Tobago and that it will serve as an outstanding example to all other nations of how interracial harmony can be attained through true participatory democracy.

ABOLITION OF FISHERY POSTS INDICATIVE OF LOWLY POSITION OF FISHERIES IN U.S. GOVERNMENT

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a Presidential directive to the departments of the executive branch has ordered a reduction of budgets and expenditures by 10 percent. I am firmly in favor of cutting Government expenses, but not at the risk of losing valuable services.

The loss of three of the four U.S. foreign fishery attaché posts would save money, it is true, but it also would eliminate a valuable service to the American fishing industry, and it indicates the lowly position of fisheries in our Government.

The Tokyo post particularly is important to the fishery resources of the Pacific Ocean and the fishing industry of the United States.

The Tokyo post renders aid on such matters as International Commissions; a wide variety of fisheries, all of which are of great importance to the U.S. fishing industry; the prevention of gear damage resulting from different or competing fisheries on the same grounds; the procurement of oyster seed for oyster industry on the U.S. west coast; fishery advice and aid to Asiatic countries such as Vietnam and South Korea; and fishery intelligence regarding fisheries in the Pacific Ocean and the fishing activities of the Pacific Ocean.

I strongly urge the President to reconsider any cutback or elimination of these offices.

Meanwhile, I call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution from the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission recommending a department and Cabinet post for marine fisheries. Such a department and Cabinet post would place more proper attention to the U.S. Government on the vital needs of our sadly sagging fishing industry.

I insert the aforementioned resolution at this point of the RECORD. And, likewise, I insert a letter I have written to Under Secretary of State Elliot Richardson requesting that these attaché posts be maintained.

The resolution and letter follow:

RESOLUTION NO. 21, ADOPTED AT ANNUAL MEETING, COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, NOVEMBER 22, 1968

Recommending a department and cabinet post for marine fisheries—Whereas, the management of our fishery resources is vital to the future of the United States, and

Whereas, the United States and the world's populations are increasing at a startling rate and will need this food to an increasing degree, and

Whereas, the fishery is a major and vital industry supplying employment and recreation to a significant segment of our population, and

Whereas, there are many agencies concerned with fishery policies, and

Whereas, the United States should regain its position as a leader in the world's fishery,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission urge the Congress and the President of the United States move to regain the United States' position as a leader in the world's fishery by creating a new department and cabinet post for marine fisheries to deal with those matters which are beyond state jurisdiction.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 3, 1969.

Hon. ELLIOT RICHARDSON,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that the Department of State has under consideration a reduction in overseas personnel that would eliminate three of the four fishery attache positions now in operation. While my constituents in the Northwest are particularly concerned about the Tokyo post, may I also object in the strongest terms to the elimination of any of these posts.

The fishing industry has its grievous problems not the least of which is the influx of imported products in ever-increasing number. One of the important functions of these attaches has been to keep in touch with industry interests in the country or countries to which they are assigned and to relay information to both government and private interests in this country. In this way we have been made aware of moves made by fishing interests in other countries which might threaten the livelihood of our own industry.

Our Tokyo attache has kept the West Coast informed of new fisheries contemplated by the Japanese, and of moves by South Korea, Taiwan, and Russia in certain areas now fished by Americans and Canadians.

The Mexico City attache has kept our shrimp industry informed about trends in the area of Central America. I might add that had the Lima position not been abolished last year, it would have been of great value in the recent difficulties with Chile, Ecuador, and Peru.

Our Abidjan, Ivory Coast attache has perhaps a greater responsibility than any of the others, although his area is not presently the most prominent one. The fishery problems along the Ivory Coast have grown increasingly complex as more tuna and shrimp interests have been moving into the Gulf of Guinea. Russia and Japan have already signaled their intentions to enter these waters on a full-scale basis. In light of these developments it is imperative that we establish and maintain firm and long-lasting friendships with both the governments along the Ivory Coast and those involved in fishing off the Coast.

The Fishery attache program, which was scheduled to involve eight posts by 1970, was cut by one-third last year. Now it is threatened by a 75 percent cut if all three posts are abandoned. It is my understanding that the President called for a ten percent cut in overseas assignments. Even one man taken from this skeletal program means a 25 percent cut.

Certainly with several hundred agricultural attaches, a dozen or more labor, commercial, and science attaches, we can afford the $200,000 or so it costs to maintain the four fishery attaches and their families for the benefit of the many thousands of men and women involved in the fishing industry of the United States.

As I am sure you are aware, Mr. Secretary, 70% of the fish consumed today is imported and our domestic industry is threatened with destruction. In this connection either we impose economic sanction or negotiate with fish producing nations so that reasonable solutions can be worked out to share fairly in the growth of American consumption of fish products. In this respect a fishery attache can serve a very useful purpose.

I would be glad to discuss this matter with you, and I urge your full consideration of the effect the contemplated move would have on this centuries-old industry before any decision is made.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

ROTC—WELLSPRING OF LEADERSHIP

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the August issue of the VFW magazine contains a very excellent article entitled "ROTC—Wellspring of Leadership." This excellent article was written by Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Army Chief of Staff.

As one who is vitally interested in seeing this program continued on our college campuses, I was pleased to note General Westmoreland's strong support for ROTC. I know that many of our colleagues also share an interest in this important matter and I recommend to them the following very fine article by General Westmoreland:

ROTC—WELLSPRING OF LEADERSHIP—CITIZEN-SOLDIER CONCEPT STRENGTHENS AMERICA

(By Gen. William C. Westmoreland)

One of our nation's outstanding soldiers recently assumed the duties of Deputy Commander of the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam. He is Gen. William B. Rosson, former Commander, First Field Force, Vietnam, and holder of the Distinguished Service Cross—our nation's second highest award for valor. Gen. Rosson is a graduate of the University of Oregon.

In Paris, another distinguished soldier was recently assigned by President Nixon to be military advisor at the Paris peace talks. He is Lt. Gen. Fred C. Weyand, former Commander of Second Field Force, Vietnam, and also a holder of the DSC.

This soldier-diplomat is a graduate of the University of California.

In the Pentagon, two other eminent soldiers occupy two of the highest positions on the Army staff. One is the Assistant Vice Chief of Staff, Army Lt. Gen. William DePuy, twice winner of the DSC, former Commander of the 1st Infantry Division, and a graduate of the University of South Dakota. The other is the Chief, Office of Reserve Components. He is Lt. Gen. William R. Peers, three times recipient of the Distinguished Service Medal, former Commander of First Field Force, Vietnam, and a graduate of UCLA.

These officers—as well as 148 other general officers currently on active duty and serving in various positions of national trust and great responsibility—are all ROTC graduates. They are products of a college pre-commissioning system which throughout the years has produced officers of the caliber of Nobel Peace Prize winner Gen. George C. Marshall and former Army Chief of Staff, Gen. George Decker. They have left their mark on the pages of history. Such men have contributed much to the progress of this nation—not only in the area of national defense, but in the diplomatic arena of international affairs.

Where did these soldier-statesmen get their start? First, they came from average American homes throughout our nation and matriculated through normal primary and secondary school systems in their home areas.

The next step was an adventure in independence and decisionmaking as college students. In college they met new challenges as they were introduced to the environment of group living and associations with other young people from varying backgrounds. This was the start of a liberal education that would prepare them for a life of leadership.

During their college years each of them was favorably influenced by the Professor of Military Science and members of his staff, or they probably would not have completed ROTC. Their wise decision to become ROTC cadets set them on their way to heights of personal achievement in the service of their nation. Earlier they had recognized the value and satisfaction to be gained from careers in public service. They saw the advantage of competing for a commission as an Army officer, while concurrently completing the requirements for a baccalaureate degree.

This year more than 16,400 young men like them will raise their hands and recite the oath of allegiance to the United States—an oath which will start them on one of the most developmental phases of their lives. Perhaps among that number is another George C. Marshall. We can be certain there will be many who will make their mark in history. We know the vast majority will serve with great distinction. Most of them will return to civilian life better equipped to accept the reins of civilian leadership in their own communities.

There is good reason for the success of the ROTC program throughout the years. Looking at the past, we can see that the concept of ROTC is fundamental to our national philosophy. ROTC traces its lineage to the establishment of military training at colleges and universities such as Norwich University in 1819 and Virginia Military Institute in 1839. Later, the Land Grant Act of 1862 provided for military training at state universities in return for land concessions from the federal government.

ROTC legislation enacted in 1916 was conceived as an outgrowth of the philosophy of Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood when he was Army Chief of Staff. General Wood's policy regarding military force structure was one of "reasonable preparedness" to include having the largest possible trained reserve force. Accordingly, a system was created to produce in times of peace a large number of educated reserve officers—officers who could lead troops in times of emergency.

This basic concept of the citizen-soldier has characterized the U.S. Army since the Minutemen of Lexington and Concord took their hunting muskets from over their fireplaces to fight for freedom. The very foundation of our national strength—our Constitution—codified this principle. The Constitution states that "The Congress shall have the power . . . to raise and support armies . . . to provide and maintain a navy . . . to provide for calling forth the militia . . . to execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions . . ."

With the lessons of European history well in mind, our founding fathers wanted to preclude the establishment of a large permanent military force during times of peace. They wrote the Constitution to embody three principles which have characterized America's armed forces to this day.

First, the concept of "raising armies" envisioned citizen forces which could be mobilized in time of emergency to respond to threats to national security.

Second, the principle of maintaining forces in readiness called for naval forces inbeing that were essential to the protection of the young republic.

Third, the idea of a standing militia conceived of civilian soldiers who were prepared to respond to internal as well as external emergencies.

Superimposed on this conceptual system of military preparedness were sufficient checks and balances within the legislative and executive branches of government to assure civilian control of the citizens' army. The provisions of the Constitution are as valid today as they were in the beginning and they provide our nation with sufficient flexibility to meet any commitments in national security matters.

The machinery established by the Constitution places control of the military in the hands of civilian leadership which, in turn, is responsive to the electorate. The tradition of civilian control of the exercise of military force is a cornerstone of our concept of defense. It is ingrained in the American way of life, and even those who may be called professional soldiers welcome and cherish this tradition; they would have it no other way.

To maintain a healthy military establishment, the Army seeks to preserve a balance between the citizen-soldier and the professional soldier. The objective is to have a continuous movement of citizens in and out of its ranks in order that it may truly represent and identify with the people it serves.

To do this, the Army must draw first upon the complete spectrum of the American population. It must represent every geographical, economic, ethnic and cultural facet of our society. The leadership of the Army must also represent the cross section of America—drawing upon the diverse disciplines of the American university systems to supply educated and humanizing leadership required to cope with today's challenges.

The Army turns quite naturally for its educated, potential leaders to the wellspring of the nation's knowledge, the American university system. Operating in an on-campus environment, the ROTC program produces officers possessing a variety of civilian intellectual backgrounds—men with technological, political, economic and sociological skills. These skills are typical of the men needed by the armed forces to carry out the complex missions assigned to them.

The days when wars were fought by military strategy and tactics alone have long since passed. Rather, both the maintenance of peace and security and the waging of war require the skillful blending of all the aspects of national power—political, socioeconomic, psychological and military. Leaders today must have an awareness and appreciation of all of these factors, if they are to accomplish the tasks given them.

There is only one source for men with this potential. This is the college campus of America. Here can be found the products of a liberal education—men who have had their vision expanded in the humanizing environment of free academic inquiry to assimilate competently and efficiently a myriad of interrelated matters and place them into perspective.

The Army today is complex, not just because of the demands of advanced technology but because the Army is consistently involved in highly complex situations. Officers charged with leadership of troops and management of national resources are required to cope simultaneously with life and death situations. The nature of these challenges warrants the efforts of our best educated youth. Furthermore, the parents of young Americans expect their sons to be led by the best, an expectation which must be met.

The ROTC program has undergone considerable change since its inception because progressive change is a necessary ingredient of any successful program. The first ingredient is a well educated group of professional people to direct the program. Young officers are assigned to ROTC duty each year. All have baccalaureate degrees. Many have or are pursuing advanced degrees.

Not too long departed from the college campus themselves, these young officers reflect the emphasis placed on education by the Army—an Army which boasts 90-plus% of officers with baccalaureate degrees and over 20% with master's or higher degrees. The youth, ability and integrity of these officers enable them to identify with the students they help teach. They are respected by the cadets who see in them the personification of American youth with all its confidence and vigor.

They are forthright, enthusiastic, personable and decisive. They have their eyes on the future and can be counted on to give straight, honest answers. They think for themselves as progressive American young men. They are available to the ROTC cadets for valuable advice and counsel. These officers also contribute to the academic community. Together with their families, they enter into civic, religious and academic activities. These articulate, dependable and compassionate professionals are a most magnificent group. They are dedicated to the development of the young men who learn in their classrooms—to their development as good American citizens.

Still another ingredient of the vigorous ROTC on-campus program is a flexible approach to academic matters. ROTC curriculum need not be stereotyped. To keep pace with the changing academic scene, revisions have been made. The Army's current curriculum concepts will bring an additional measure of flexibility to the program. This curriculum recognizes that the mission of the ROTC is to obtain college graduates who have the potential to become quality officers.

Greater emphasis will be placed on specific academic subjects within a core curriculum. Some students in selected disciplines may be required to carry Army-taught professional subjects as an overload. It is certainly not unreasonable to expect students to do this if the reward is proportionate to the amount of work involved. In the ROTC program, it is a commission, the gold bar of the second lieutenant.

The Financial Assistance Program now in its fourth year will graduate the first group of four-year scholarship winners this year. This extremely successful program has drawn the finest high school students to our college and university campuses. These young men are selected on a "whole man" system which evaluates their organizational ability and athletic prowess, together with their scholastic aptitude. It has produced exemplary young college graduates for the officer corps.

The majority of scholarship winners will receive Regular Army commissions and will embark on rewarding and satisfying careers as professional Army officers. As they advance through the junior grades, they will receive additional schooling, both military and civilian. The majority will receive advanced academic degrees. These young men represent the finest qualities of American youth. Their entry on active duty strengthens our junior officer ranks and offers great hope for quality leadership of our Army of the future.

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps has been the saving force in our past. It is the continued hope of the future. Requirements for high-caliber leadership do not diminish with time. The advanced technology and sophistication of our modern-day Army demand that the Officers Corps be continually enriched by men who are worthy of the many challenges of the future.

ROTC has stood the test of time and it has grown to the point where it is the major source of commissioned officers for our active Army. As we march toward the 21st Century, we look to this viable program to continue to provide the leadership—both military and civilian—that our great country has always surfaced from the mainstream of its civilian society.

PAKISTAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, soon after the last war, in July 1947, Great Britain granted India's independence. The Pakistani people constituted their own state and proclaimed their own independence on August 14 of that year.

The Islamic Republic of Pakistan is among the largest postwar states, with an area about 365,000 square miles and population nearly 120 million. Pakistani leaders have shown maturity and agility in guiding the destiny of their country. And they have been rather successful in their effort to reconcile certain unruly tribal groups in the country. The country's economy has been fairly well balanced, partly thanks to the financial aid of the United States. U.S. aid has been significant in bolstering up Pakistan's defenses. At the same time, Pakistan has shown diplomatic adroitness in obtaining aid also from the Soviet Union.

Recently there have been drastic changes in the government of the country, and for the present it is ruled by a military group, which seems to have considerable public support. The country's long-time leader, Ayub Khan, has retired, but his successors appear to be capable of coping with Pakistan's domestic and foreign problems.

We wish the Pakistanis peace and prosperity in this their 22d year of independence.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE TO OBSERVE ITS 175TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a very important anniversary will be celebrated next week in Tennessee. The University of Tennessee will observe its 175th year, and its 100th year as a land-grant institution, on September 10.

In 175 years the University of Tennessee has grown into the 22d largest institution of higher education in the Nation and the third in the Southeast. The theme of this anniversary observance is "Distinguished Past—Dynamic Future," and at this point I include in the RECORD a very interesting summary statement on UT's development by President A. D. Holt:

ANNIVERSARY YEAR

September 10, 1969 marks the beginning of an auspicious year for The University of Tennessee. On that date the institution will launch the observance of its 175th anniversary. For double measure, the 100th anniversary of the University's designation as Tennessee's Federal Land-Grant Institution will also be celebrated.

In the academic world, these two anniversaries place The University of Tennessee in a unique position. It is the 28th oldest institution of higher education among the 2,300 colleges and universities in America. Moreover, it is one of only 68 Federal Land-Grant Institutions of the nation, and one of only 30 holding both that responsibility and the position of the official State University.

But, more important, these anniversaries signify the intimate relationship of The University of Tennessee to the history of the Volunteer State. Created two years before Tennessee attained statehood, the University has contributed to the progress of the state from frontier days to the present era of space exploration. On the one hand, the institution has offered Tennessee youth educational opportunities for fruitful and satisfying careers; on the other, it has provided professional and vocational specialists as well as the research and public service programs required for a forward-moving state.

"Distinguished Past—Dynamic Future" is the theme of the University's 175th anniversary. This phrase reflects a well-earned pride in the institution's history and a dedicated confidence in its goals ahead. Following are some of the University's distinctive achievements which give substance to the anniversary theme:

1. UT has grown into the 22nd largest institution of higher education in the nation, and the 3rd largest in the Southeast.

2. The broad development of UT's pro-

grams of study to encompass 20 colleges and schools and 308 degree programs, from the bachelor's to the postdoctoral level, has placed the institution among the nation's leaders. In the broadening of its instructional programs, UT has become an outstanding graduate study and research center.

3. UT has an eminent faculty, including scholars who are internationally recognized in their specialized fields. The University was one of the institutions selected to receive a national "Centers of Excellence" grant.

4. UT's library, containing more than a million books, ranks with the top 50 of the nation.

5. The phenomenal growth of UT's physical plant has won national attention because of its attractiveness and diversity, and has helped advance the prestige of the University as well as its capability to serve growing enrollments and the educational objectives of faculty and students.

6. UT's student body has earned special praise because of its high character and responsible deportment during the recent period when a number of college campuses were struck by disruptive behavior of students.

7. The prominence of UT's alumni, who hold positions of high responsibility and leadership in all fields of endeavor, has reflected great credit upon the institution. UT now has approximately 130,000 alumni throughout the state, nation, and world.

8. UT's athletic teams in all collegiate sports have been highly successful and have focused favorable national attention upon the institution.

Even with its impressive past, the University must continue to move forward in response to the rising needs of the state. A striking example will be the establishment of the UT at Chattanooga campus, created by a merger with the University of Chattanooga.

The challenges and opportunities that are already unfolding will offer the University a promising and dynamic future. As a new state-wide organization of higher education, with academic campuses and other centers in all regions of Tennessee, the institution possesses the resources to build and maintain pre-eminence in its programs of instruction, research and public service. In this manner UT will contribute more richly to the advancement and dynamic future of the State of Tennessee.

To stay in the forefront of rapidly changing times, UT must continue to offer the best possible undergraduate, graduate, research and public service programs. Its Knoxville campus, which has operations throughout the state, must offer strong undergraduate courses, and should give increased attention to graduate, professional, research and public service activities for both the rural and urban populations of the state. Its Medical Units campus at Memphis must continue its development as one of the nation's leading medical centers—in teaching and research. Its campus at Martin must continue expanding in the undergraduate fields, and also in some graduate studies, to serve the people of the region. Its new campus at Chattanooga must develop as an outstanding metropolitan institution in both undergraduate and graduate programs. And its programs at the Nashville Center, the Memphis Center, the Kingsport Center, the Space Institute, the Oak Ridge Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, and the state-wide operations of the Government-Industry-Law Center must continue their progress for the full realization of their great potentialities.

As The University of Tennessee observes its 175th year—its 100th as a Land-Grant Institution—the past will be recognized but the future will be emphasized. A special University committee chaired by Vice President Edward J. Boling is coordinating a series of events to commemorate these anniversaries, which officially begin with a Founder's Day program at Knoxville on September 10, 1969—the birthday of UT's earliest predecessor.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY POLISH ENSLAVEMENT

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this week, and particularly September 1, marks the 30th anniversary of the invasion of the then free nation, Poland, which sparked the start of World War II. At that time the world little realized what the immediate future held for millions of people in their own free democracies then enjoying self-government, prosperity, and peace.

Stalin and his Communist forces at that time, aided and abetted by Hitler and his Nazi stormtroopers, proceeded on their ambitious program to not only wipe out freedom in Poland, but to eventually enslave all the nations of Europe, and with the aid of the Japanese war machine, their ultimate goal was to conquer the world and inflict atheistic communism on all mankind. Although the freedom-loving Polish people fought valiantly they were so vastly outnumbered victory was impossible, and millions of patriots and lovers of self-government were massacred or transferred to Siberian slave labor camps and robbed of their liberty and national freedom which they so valiantly won during and after World War I.

It is very fitting and proper that our Nation and all free nations throughout the world be reminded of the methods and barbarity used by the Communist dictators during those dark days of aggression.

The people of America have not forgotten, and should never forget, the great contribution Polish patriots and Polish leaders contributed back in our Revolutionary time in order to bring about American independence and establish our own free republic. Future Polish generations not only descendants from the pioneers of our Revolutionary period, but millions of Poles in their homeland and those who emigrated to our shores, have always fought and supported our land, during our intervening troubles, since the days of George Washington. We should never forget that, although Poland and other lands are under the dominations of Communist slavery, the spirit of human freedom never dies, and that tyranny and enslavement cannot exist permanently.

War-like rumblings and bitterness now existing between the two world Communist giants—the Soviets and the Chinese—no doubt will soon be engaged in mortal combat. That day may arrive sooner than many world leaders now predict. No doubt the system of government under tyranny now inflicted by the Soviet Communists must eventually capitulate. When that time comes Poland and other enslaved nations will again restore freedom and self-government within their borders.

It is up to our own Nation and other free nations to keep the world alerted and the younger generation informed as to the methods used by the Communist tyrants in enslaving free peoples in the past. The battle for freedom for all humanity must not cease and present and future generations should continue to fight tyranny and slavery in order to preserve the future for all humanity, including the nation of Poland whose anniversary of attack 30 years ago should be brought to the minds of the youth all over the globe in order to protect liberty and humanity in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a letter from the Palo Alto Times, Palo Alto, Calif., August 12, 1969, which was submitted to me by Julius Epstein of 2120 Ash Street, Palo Alto, Calif. Mr. Epstein was one of the active supporters of and contributed great service to the success of the special congressional committee that was authorized in the 82d Congress to investigate and expose the real truth regarding the Katyn Forest Massacre, which was part and parcel of the Soviet Communist attacks in the winter of 1939–40 to enslave Poland.

The special congressional committee not only held hearings in the United States but also in London and on the European Continent, the testimony of which was publicized throughout the globe. The massacre of almost 15,000 Polish intelligentsia was committed by Stalin and his fellow murderers in order to prevent future leaders from reestablishing Polish independence and self-government.

The letter referred to follows:

MEMORIALIZE KATYN MURDERS

EDITOR OF THE TIMES:

April and May 1970 will mark the 30th anniversary of one of the greatest crimes in modern military history: The Katyn Forest Massacre of more than 4,000 Polish officers, prisoners of war in Soviet camps.

The more than 4,000 Polish officers found in the mass graves at Katyn, USSR, constitute only a part of the more than 15,000 Polish officers murdered by Stalin and his NKVD. At Katyn, only those Polish officers were massacred who came from the Soviet POW camp at Kozielsk. The remaining 11,000 were killed in the vicinity of their camps, Starobielsk, Ostashkov as well as in the White Sea where they had been put on barges which were sunk by the NKVD.

The American Congress spent almost two years investigating the Katyn Massacre and—to a certain degree—the murder of the remaining 11,000 Polish officers whose bodies have not yet been found. Their mass graves are only known to God and the Kremlin.

The Select House Committee to Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre (Chairman: Ray J. Madden of Indiana) which held hearings in 1951 and 1952 in the U.S. as well as in Europe proved beyond any doubt that Stalin and his NKVD had murdered 15,000 Polish officers who had been prisoners of war in Soviet camps.

The 30th anniversary of the Katyn Massacre should be commemorated by the American people.

I, therefore, submit the following suggestions:

1. A national gift from the American people to the Polish people in form of a monument to be erected in Warsaw with the sole inscription "In memory of the 4,243 Polish patriots murdered at Katyn, USSR."

2. An international Katyn conference to be sponsored by one of our universities. Among the guests to be invited to address

the conference should be General Anders and the seven former members of the American Select House Committee to Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre.

3. A Katyn exhibition which should display the documents and literature proving the Soviet crime, photographs of the open mass graves at Katyn, the seven volumes issued by the congressional committee which investigated the massacre.

4. The issuance of an American Katyn Memorial stamp.

Palo Alto.

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

A SALUTE TO SENEGAL

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 20, a former French colony in West Africa—Senegal—celebrated the ninth anniversary of her independence. During the past 9 years, Senegal has made commendable efforts for growth and progress, and it is with pleasure that I salute her on this independence day.

The French landed at what is now the town of St. Louis in 1633, and found a fertile, mildly tropical land. The indigenous population was predominantly Moslem, and still is, despite the determined efforts of Catholic missionaries. As there was a good harbor, the French decided to claim St. Louis. Through conquest or persuasion, the French expanded and claimed more territory, creating the area now known as Senegal.

Senegal, in fact, was one of the more fortunate colonies, and received many benefits from the long French stay. The French policy of assimilating colonial peoples into the French culture was carried out to the greatest extent in the colony of Senegal. The results were numerous: high quality education for many Senegalese, the introduction of the peanut plant—now the most important crop in the economy—the introduction of a monetary system, and so forth. In certain sections of the colony, the Senegalese held partial citizenship status, which gave them rights not normally available to colonial peoples. A limited form of political representation was granted, allowing Senegalese delegates to participate in France's National Assembly. The French system of education was the inspiration for the University of Dakar, now the finest university in West Africa. The long French presence also encouraged the development of a relatively large, knowledgeable urban population, and was instrumental in the creation of the good port facilities at Dakar.

Thus when Senegal became independent, she started from a level to which other newly independent nations were and still are aspiring. In a land somewhat lacking in natural resources, Senegal has been fortunate to have an abundance of human resources. She has used those resources to implement many programs in education and agriculture. One of the most interesting programs that Senegal has tried has been the "animation rurale" program. Under this plan, young people from the rural areas, after training and education, go back to their villages and set up educational and agricultural programs—a Senegalese form of the Peace Corps.

Senegal has tried to encourage foreign investment, and develop her industry. Her fishing industry is especially promising for future growth. In agriculture, Senegal is introducing new methods of cultivation, and new crops, such as rice. The introduction of new crops is of great importance, for peanuts are now Senegal's main source of revenue. The crop diversification program should go a long way toward lessening Senegal's dependence on the peanut.

One other way that Senegal has been extremely fortunate has been in the quality and caliber of her leaders. Foremost of these is, of course, the President, Leopold Sedar Senghor. Senghor is an astute politician and leader, but he is perhaps better known for his intellectual achievements, as the author of the concepts of "Negritude" and "African Socialism." He has also been instrumental in keeping Senegal peaceful, stable, and forward moving. Senegal indeed has a leader that she can be very proud of. I am happy to extend my best wishes and congratulations to Senegal and her people, and wish them much success in the years ahead.

COTTON FARMERS LOSE MARKETS TO TEXTILE IMPORTS

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, those of us from cotton-producing States continue to be concerned about the seemingly ever-increasing cotton imports which are coming into this country from Japan and other foreign markets.

These imports are hurting our domestic mills, but equally as important, they are hurting the American farmer. In the last crop year alone, imports accounted for almost equivalent of 1 million bales of cotton.

But the effect of these imports goes even further, since it means that less agriproducts such as tractors, insecticides, fertilizer, and farm machinery will be purchased.

In the early months of this administration, the cotton industry was encouraged by the action of the Honorable Maurice Stans, the Secretary of Commerce. There is much evidence to indicate his concern through his recent visit to Japan in which he pointed out the necessity for effecting voluntary quota restriction by the Japanese Government. The industry is watching closely in hopes that the Japanese delegation, scheduled to visit our country later this month will explore this request in much detail. The American textile industry, the cotton producers throughout the Cotton Belt from Virginia to California, and the U.S. Congress are going to be insistent that these reductions be effected. Should they not be forthcoming on a voluntary basis, I have the definite feeling that legislation will be backed in both Houses to correct the import situation which has long since gotten out of hand.

The August issue of the Progressive Farmer magazine carried a very timely article by Dr. Eugene Butler, their editor in chief, which I believe my colleagues will find of interest. It points up in a very cogent way the loss of markets from these foreign textile imports.

The article follows:

COTTON FARMERS LOSE MARKETS TO TEXTILE IMPORTS

(By Eugene Butler)

Most folks know that manmade fibers are giving cotton fits in the marketplace. But many growers do not realize that cotton grown in other countries and imported into this country as textiles is also capturing many of our domestic markets.

Our imports of cotton as textiles have grown from 225,000 bales in 1956 to 970,000 bales in 1968. And there is every indication that this upward trend will continue in the future. So strong is the competition from manmade fibers and cotton textile imports that U.S. textile mills are expected this season to use 750,000 bales less cotton than last. And this is happening at a time when consumption of textile fibers is increasing. There was an 8% increase last season.

An import quota system has been in effect for cotton textiles since 1961, but it obviously needs to be strengthened. There are no quotas on wool textile imports, which have also been increasing rapidly. Both cotton and wool producers are seriously affected by textile imports made from manmade fibers, and these, with no quota restraints, have been rising the fastest of all in recent years.

It is this situation that led President Nixon on March 4 to state that while he favors freer trade, it is necessary to work out voluntary restraints on textile imports.

Cotton is an important export crop. And cotton's export marekt is of vital importance to U.S. growers. They would be extremely foolish if by limiting cotton textile imports, they destroyed even more valuable markets abroad. These markets could be destroyed if, in selling abroad, we refused to accept the competition of reasonable imports in the form of cotton textiles. But it is simply not reasonable to let these imports absorb all the increase in our domestic consumption and even force the consumption of our own cotton by our own textile industry into a decline. Yet this is what is happening.

In spite of cotton's well documented case, there is strong opposition to curbing cotton as well as other textile imports. The U.S.-Japan Trade Council, for example, claims that there is no economic excuse for them. It insists that the domestic textile and apparel industries do not need voluntary import quotas of textile imports because their sales and profits as well as employment, are at high levels.

Apparently the Council has overlooked the effect of increasing textile imports on the fortunes of U.S. cotton and wool producers. They, too, have a vital interest.

Imports of raw cotton have been held quite low by quotas since 1939. But cotton produced in other countries that enters this country as textiles can capture markets from U.S. cotton just as effectively as imports of raw cotton.

According to Dr. M. K. Horne of the National Cotton Council, 10 countries have been responsible for more than three-fourths of our cotton textile imports during the past three years. Depending on how you figure, says Dr. Horne, these countries obtained only 13½% to 23½% of their cotton from the United States. This means that every time we export 135,000 to 235,000 bales to these

10 countries, they send back into the United States cotton textile products that take a million bales off our markets. Obviously, this is a bad deal for U.S. cotton producers.

We sell lots of cotton to Japan, and she in turn exports to the United States a large volume of cotton textiles. Do voluntary cotton textile quotas cause Japan to buy less cotton from us? There is little evidence that our import policies, as long as they are reasonable, will have much to do with Japan's cotton purchases. Japanese textile people will continue buying their cotton where they can get the best deal as to price, financing, etc. Next to the United States, Mexico supplies Japan more cotton than any other country. Yet Mexico buys little cotton textiles, if any, from Japan. And according to Dr. Horne, the other countries from whom Japan buys cotton have incomparably stricter import controls than the United States. And, as Dr. Horne points out: "If our textile imports really did affect Japan's cotton purchases, she would be buying more cotton from us now in view of the fact that we buy more of her cotton cloth than the world's 20 next largest cotton-growing countries combined."

At the end of World War II, much of the world, including Japan, was economically prostrate. To help these troubled nations get on their feet, the United States led the world in the liberalization of its trade policies. Our trade policies, our economic aid, and our military expenditures had much to do with Japan's marvelous recovery. From a trade deficit of $500 million as recently as 1961, her favorable trade balance has grown to $2½ billion. While Japan deserves much credit for the energy and ingenuity that has made it a dynamic power in world trade, it owes much to the United States. Much of her strength stems from the fact that she has had little military expense since the war. At tremendous cost to ourselves, we have defended her interests in that part of the world. And, as Dr. Horne emphasizes, these military efforts of ours are one prime reason today for the inflation that has weakened our trade position and invited imports from every corner of the world.

Whether textile import quotas, or for that matter quotas on any import, are good or evil depends on their reasonableness. If they unduly shut off competition by stifling international trade, they are undoubtedly bad. But a cotton textile quota that not only gives imports a fair share of our present textile market but provides for an expanding share of a larger future market—is the essence of fair dealing and common sense. In view of the critical market position of U.S. cotton, it is simply not reasonable to let textile imports absorb the increase in our domestic market.

CANADIAN THANK YOU TO AMERICA

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in these days of world dissension it is rewarding and gratifying to find a letter as I read in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer during the congressional recess. This letter was written by Patricia Young of Vancouver, British Columbia, and it states the message far better than I. Mr. Speaker, I insert the letter at this point in the RECORD:

CANADIAN THANK YOU

Permit me, a Canadian, to express a long overdue "Thank You America"—not only for putting a man on the moon, but for almost two hundred years of contributing to the betterment of mankind. For the airplane, radio, cotton gin, phonograph, elevator, movie machine, typewriter, polio vaccine, safety razor, ballpoint pen and zipper!

No other land in all the world has, in so brief a history, contributed so much and asked so little—only that we live together in peace and freedom.

From the days of Washington and Lincoln, you have demonstrated the creativity, invention and progress of free men living in a free society—where ideas and aspirations may be promoted to the extent of man's willingness to work and build a "better mousetrap" with commensurate rewards.

Thank you for upholding the principles and rights of freedom and liberty; for the American Constitution and Bill of Rights and for protecting those rights even when it results in the burning of your flag and the murder of your President.

Thank you for those who helped defend freedom on foreign soil in two world wars—a debt we have been able to pay in small measure by way of some 10,000 Canadian volunteers who stand and fight with you in Vietnam; for the Foreign Aid you give even when your hand is bitten and your motives impugned; for keeping your dignity in the face of insults from nations still wet behind the ears; for your patience with those who seek to steal the world and enslave its people; for keeping your cool even when the Trojan horse mounts the steps of the White House to insolently spew forth its treason.

Thank you for keeping alive the concept of individual liberty and faith in God in a world wallowing in humanistic collectivism.

For these reasons and so much more, I say: "Thank you America and God Bless you."

PATRICIA YOUNG,
Vancouver, B.C.

A TRIBUTE TO F. PARKER WILBER

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, right at the heart of the inner city in downtown Los Angeles is the largest vocational training institution in America, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College. After 37 years of dedicated service to occupationally centered programs, the college president, F. Parker Wilber is retiring.

I wish at this time to salute him for his great record and to call attention to the necessity for increased quality vocational education.

As President Wilber says:

We are only now just scratching the surface in meeting the needs of vocational education both nationally and here at Trade-Tech.

Under his leadership the college now offers 90 separate fields of training. He has established advisory committees in every training field and today over 1,000 leaders from labor, business, and industry sit on these committees advising the college for the benefit of the students and the community.

Whereas Trade-Tech is a free public junior college, this cooperation from the private sector has resulted in nearly $2 million worth of equipment being donated.

Mr. Wilber has led the college into the era of rapid technological change. The citizens of Los Angeles have given Trade-Tech the challenge of meeting the expanding needs of the community. Business and industry require an increasing supply of intelligent, generally educated, and vocationally able citizens for the Nation's continued development. Leaders at Trade-Tech contend that automation has created more jobs thus far than have been either lost or dislocated. However, the worker in the present and future will not only have to be generally educated but more flexible and mobile.

The Trade-Tech president has literally preached to the Los Angeles community about vocational training. We should acknowledge the absolute necessity for skilled manpower and that excellence in vocational training is as educationally significant as any academic achievement. We are obligated to get this message across to parents and students if we are facing reality in an educational program.

Finally, we could not salute the president of this great institution without mentioning his concerned leadership in minority problems. More than 50 percent of the 15,000 students are Negro and nearly 15 percent are Mexican-American. Most students on campus come from either an economic or educationally disadvantaged background. Thousands of them have gone on to fine jobs and a full participation in the many benefits of our society. This is a great achievement in these times of crisis in our troubled inner cities.

The community and Nation owe a debt of gratitude to these pioneers like F. Parker Wilber for their dedication to vocational education as it relates to the vital needs of our young people.

APOLLO 11 ASTRONAUTS RELATE THEIR PERSONAL STORIES OF EPIC FLIGHT TO MOON

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the astronauts prepare for their landing in Washington, it is fitting and appropriate to call attention to their personal narratives of the historic landing on the moon, as published in the current issue of Life magazine.

Neil A. Armstrong, the command pilot, recalls that throughout the journey he and his fellow astronauts—Edwin R. Aldrin, Jr. and Michael Collins—were acutely aware that this Nation's scientific reputation was at stake to a marked degree as the world watched this epic flight.

Astronaut Aldrin describes the sensation of adjusting to the moon's gravity and Astronaut Collins tells of his reactions as he orbited around the moon in the command module awaiting the return of Armstrong and Aldrin in the lunar module.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this historic flight, I place herewith in the RECORD the personal accounts of the flight by the astronauts:

THE MOON HAD BEEN AWAITING US A LONG TIME

(By Neil A. Armstrong)

Our goal, when we were assigned to this flight last January, seemed almost impossible. There were a lot of unknowns, unproved ideas, unproved hardware. The LM had never flown. There were many things about the lunar surface we did not know. It remained to be shown that it was possible for the ground to communicate simultaneously with two vehicles up there. I honestly suspected, at the time, that it was unlikely that Apollo 11 would make the first lunar landing flight. There was just too much to learn—too many chances for problems.

Then came the flights of Apollo 9 and 10, which were so magnificently successful. It began to seem that we really would get a crack at a landing. From that point on, preparations became relentless.

We were not concerned with safety, specifically, in these preparations. We were concerned with mission success, with the accomplishment of what we set out to do. I felt a successful lunar landing might inspire men around the world to believe that impossible goals really are possible, that there really is hope for solutions to humanity's problems.

This nation was depending on the NASA-industry team to do the job, and that team was staking its reputation on Apollo 11. A lot of necks had been put voluntarily on the chopping block, and as more and more attention was focused on the flight it became perfectly evident that any failure would bring a certain tarnish to the U.S. image.

We were very conscious of the symbolism of our exploration, and we wanted the small things which go along with a flight to reflect our very serious approach to the business of flying the lunar mission.

The patch we designed was not intended to imitate the great seal of the U.S. It was meant simply to symbolize the peaceful American attempt at a lunar landing. We wanted the names we chose for communication to have both dignity and symbolism—and of course clarity in radio transmissions. The name Eagle was adopted after the patch design had been selected, and was intended to reflect both the theme of the patch and also a degree of national pride in the overall enterprise. The name Columbia is also a national symbol, and a link with the century-old Jules Verne book which turned out to be in some ways an accurate prediction of Apollo 11. But most of all it was a reflection to us of the aura of adventure, exploration and seriousness with which Columbus took his assignment.

After all the preflight preparation, there was actually somewhat less pressure on me during the flight itself. I no longer had a choice, an option, as to how I might best spend my time in training. There was one job to do and, just as with most jobs, once you're involved in it you feel more at ease.

The day of the lunar landing was a long one and there was a lot to do every minute. We got up at 5:30 that morning and touched down about 3:20 p.m. Houston time. Our ignition for powered descent was smooth and right on time. It occurred over the right spot on the lunar surface, the western edge of Mt. Marilyn. We were then flying face down at 50,000 feet and the sighting of Mt. Marilyn plus other position checks indicated that we were going to land relatively close to the carefully selected touchdown area. We weren't going to land on the wrong side of the moon or anything like that. Our landing radar next told us we were at 37,000 feet, just where we expected to be. At about 30,000 feet we began to have computer problems. When the computer is in trouble, it flashes an alarm light and a number. We had simulated a wide variety of alarms before the flight. For the most predictable we had memorized certain procedures. For the more complex ones we had scribbled little notes to ourselves on cards which we attached to the instrument panel. The inflight alarms we got, however, were not the types of alarms that had come up in any of our simulations. They seem to have come from overloading the computer, overworking it, and Mission Control really earned its money right then. They analyzed the problem and the cause and advised us promptly that we could safely override the alarms and continue our descent.

From about 30,000 feet down to 5,000 feet we were totally absorbed in analyzing and dealing with this problem, and checking our instruments. Our attention was thus diverted from the windows and from identification of landmarks outside. The first chance we had to spend some time looking out was from below 3,000 feet. With the close horizon that is characteristic of the moon, it was difficult at that height to see very far ahead. The only landmark we could see was a very large, very impressive crater which has since been identified as West Crater, though we did not recognize it at the time.

At first we considered landing just short of it. That location seemed clearly to be where our automatic guidance system was taking us. By the time we were down around 1,000 feet, however, it was quite obvious that Eagle was attempting to land in a most undesirable area. I had an excellent view of the crater and the boulder field out of the left window. There were boulders big as Volkswagens strewn all around.

The rocks seemed to be coming up at us awfully fast, although of course the clock runs about triple speed in a situation like that. My attention now was directed almost completely out the window, and Buzz was informing me of the important computer and instrument readings. At about 400 feet it became clear that I would have to take over a hybrid mode of manual control—that is, a manual attitude control with a partially automatic throttle. In this mode I was controlling the attitude and horizontal velocity of Eagle, and my commands, in conjunction with computer commands, were operating the throttle. We reduced our descent rate from 10 feet per second to about three.

It would have been interesting to land in that boulder field because I'm sure some of the ejecta coming out of such a large crater would have been lunar bedrock and, as such, fascinating to the scientists. I was tempted, but my better judgement took over. We pitched forward to a level attitude, feet straight down, to skim over the tops of the boulders, and we scanned the surface to the west for a better touchdown area. We looked at several, and I changed my mind a couple of times. One would look pretty good, and then when we got a little closer it would look less attractive. The one we chose was only a couple of hundred feet square, about the size of a big house lot. It was ringed on one side by some fairly good-sized craters and on the other with a field of small rocks, but it still looked as if we could live with it. I put Eagle down there.

I am told that my heartbeat increased noticeably during the lunar descent, but I would really be disturbed with myself if it hadn't.

Eagle flew very much like the simulators and like the lunar-landing training vehicle which I had flown more than 30 times at Ellington Air Force Base near the space center. I had made from 50 to 60 landings in the trainer, and the final trajectory which I flew to the landing was very much like those I had flown in practice. That of course gave me a good deal of confidence—a comfortable familiarity.

During the final seconds of descent, our engine kicked up a substantial amount of lunar dust which blew out radially and almost parallel to the surface, at very high velocities. Normally on earth if you kick up dust it hangs in the air and settles back to the ground very slowly. But since there is no atmosphere on the moon, dust sails away in a flat, low trajectory, leaving a clear space behind it. The dust we kicked up probably still hadn't settled on the lunar surface by the time we landed, but it was a long way away from us and going fast. It was possible to see through it—I could make out rocks and craters—but its sheer motion was distracting. It made it difficult to pick out the translational velocities for a smooth touchdown. It was much like landing in a very fast-moving ground fog.

I was quite concerned about the fuel level at this final stage of descent. The gauges were registering close to empty and we actually were quite close to a mandatory abort in which we would have fired the ascent engine and returned—hopefully—to orbit. But by far our safest and most desirable situation was to go ahead and land. We certainly did not want an unnecessary abort. Despite the low gauge levels, I probably had something like 40 seconds' worth of fuel left at landing. It's always nice when you read "empty" to have a gallon left.

Buzz and I had about 12 minutes of very busy post-touchdown work, and then we could relax enough to have a sense of relief, of elation.

It took us somewhat longer to emerge from Eagle than we had anticipated but the delay was not, as my wife and perhaps some others have half-jokingly suggested, to give me time to think about what to say when I actually stepped out onto the moon. I had thought about that a little before the flight, mainly because so many people had made such a big point of it. I had also thought about it a little on the way to the moon, but not much. It wasn't until after landing that I made up my mind what to say: "That's one small step for a man, one giant leap for mankind." Beyond those words I don't recall any particular emotion or feeling other than a little caution, a desire to be sure it was safe to put my weight on that surface outside Eagle's footpad.

From inside Eagle the sky was black, but it looked like daylight out on the surface and the surface looked tan. There is a very peculiar lighting effect on the lunar surface which seems to make the colors change. I don't understand this completely. If you look downsun, down along your own shadow, or into sun, the moon is tan. If you look cross-sun it is darker, and if you look straight down at the surface, particularly in the shadows, it looks very, very dark. When you pick up material in your hands it is also dark, gray or black. The material is of a generally fine texture, almost like flour, but some coarser particles are like sand. Then there are, of course, scattered rocks and rock chips of all sizes.

My only real problem on the surface was that there were so many places that I would like to have investigated, to find out just what was beyond the next hill, so to speak. I thought I would be able to see the rim of West Crater behind the LM, but the abrupt curvature of the moon's horizon prevented it. I was able to walk out to an 80-foot crater that we had seen and photographed during the final phase of descent.

All the things we left on the moon are pretty well known by now. We were particularly pleased to deposit the patch of Apollo 1 in memory of our friends and fellow astronauts Gus Grissom, Ed White and Roger Chaffee, and the medals that were struck in commemoration of Gagarin and Komarov. I believe that those gentlemen and their associates share our own dreams and hopes for a better world.

I was encouraged in this belief by a telegram of congratulations which was waiting for us in the Lunar Receiving Laboratory when we returned. It began "Dear Colleagues," and it was signed by all the cosmonauts who have flown.

In addition to the things we left on the moon we also carried and brought back some American flags, some first-day covers of the lunar landing, and for ourselves some small flags and medallions which are essentially miniature replicas of our patch. Most important for the rest of the world, we brought back those rock boxes.

In retrospect touchdown was for me the single most striking point of achievement in the flight. Lift-off was the next most striking. I thought quite a bit about that single ascent engine and how much depended upon it. When the moment came it was perfection. It gave us not only a very pleasant ride but it also afforded us a beautiful, fleeting, final view of Tranquillity Base as we lifted up and away from it.

My overwhelming impression of the moon as I walked on it and photographed it was that Buzz and I were taking pictures of a steady-state process, a process in which some rocks are being worn down continually on the surface and other new ones are being thrown out on top by new events occurring either near or far away. So that, in other words, no matter when man first reached this spot—a thousand years ago or 100,000 years ago or even a million years from now—it would look generally the same. It would always present the same aspect. The only difference would be that at each period in time man would be seeing slightly different rocks, slightly different surfaces, all influenced by the same processes. From what I saw I believe that most of the processes are external (*i.e.*, things like meteorite impact), but there are materials involved which indicate that there may have been internal processes on the moon at some time.

The most dramatic recollections I have now are the sights themselves, those magnificent visual images. They go far beyond any other visual experiences I've had in my life. Of all the spectacular views we had, the most impressive to me was on the way toward the moon, when we flew through its shadow. We were still thousands of miles away but close enough so that the moon almost filled our circular window. It was eclipsing the sun, from our position, and the corona of the sun was visible around the rim of the moon as a gigantic lens-shaped or saucer-shaped light stretching out to several lunar diameters. It was magnificent, but the moon itself was even more so. We were in its shadow so there was no part of it illuminated by the sun. It was illuminated only by the earth, by earthshine. It made the moon appear blue-gray and the entire scene looked decidedly three-dimensional.

I was really aware, visually aware, that the moon was in fact a sphere, not a disk. It seemed almost as if it were showing us its roundness, its similarity in shape to our earth, in a sort of welcome. I was sure then that it would be a hospitable host. It had been awaiting its first visitors for a long time.

LUNAR DUST SMELLED JUST LIKE GUNPOWDER

(By Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr.)

I am curious to find out just how long those footprints will linger on the surface of the moon. It was a very good surface for footprints. The light, rather powdery material turned out to have considerable cohesion and it compacted easily.

The moon was a very natural and very pleasant environment in which to work. It had many of the advantages of zero gravity in that all movements required a very low application of force, but it was in a sense less *lonesome* than zero-G, where you always have to pay attention to securing attachment points to give you some means of leverage, where you have no sense of up or down and there is no such thing as having any balance. In one-sixth gravity, on the moon, you have a distinct feeling of being *somewhere* and you have a constant, though at many times ill-defined, sense of direction and force. My recommendation to future crews would be to set aside the first of 15 or 20 minutes of their extravehicular activity just to work out, in their own individual ways, the best method of moving and to establish for themselves a confidence level of motion. Our best simulations on earth, the water tank and the one-sixth-G aircraft, are both somewhat misleading. The resistive forces in water are too high to permit any rapid movement, and the experiences in the aircraft are too brief. Trying to remember back to simulations might lead to as many wrong conclusions as right ones, on the moon.

One very interesting thing was that the horizontal reference on the moon is not at all well defined. That is, it's difficult to know when you are leaning forward or backward and to what degree. This fact, coupled with the rather limited field of vision from our helmets, made local features on the moon appear to change slope depending on which way you were looking and how you were standing. The back pack weighs just over 20 pounds on the lunar surface (on earth it weighs 124 pounds), but even that weight tends to pull you backward and you must consciously lean forward just a little to compensate for it. I believe someone has described the posture as "tired ape"—almost erect but slumped forward a little. It was difficult sometimes to know when you were standing erect. I found that determining my position, establishing the center of my own gravity, required leaning from one side to the other to test it.

It feels as if you can lean farther in any direction, without losing your balance, than you can on earth. Neither of us ever fell during our activities. We felt that it would be fairly easy to get down to our knees and then get up again. It was also quite possible to lean over, with just a small amount of support. We dropped one film pack from a camera and fortunately it dropped in close vicinity of the bottom of the ladder, near a footpad. Neil was able to support himself quite easily with one hand on the landing gear strut and lean down and pick it up.

The actual traction under our feet and recovery from imbalance were inferior to that which we had simulated in the one-sixth-gravity aircraft. The surface on the cushioned rubber floor of the airplane was quite stable and traction was easy. On the moon it was more difficult. The depth to which our feet penetrated in this odd, powdery-looking surface varied considerably. In many places we sank only a fraction of an inch, but the rims of some small depression craters seemed to have a deeper soft layer. Our boots actually went in three or four inches. This created a tendency for slipping sideways when the boot finally hit something hard, and we tried to move around as much as possible on level areas, avoiding the little depressions. We also tried to avoid stepping on rocks which looked as if they might move. It was easy to dislodge rocks on the order of six to eight inches; they did not seem to be firmly rooted. I recall one rather large rock, quite flat, which felt slippery. It had dust particles clinging to it, and those plus the particles which clung to the sole of my boots created this slipping tendency.

Never at any time did Neil and I find working there fatiguing; we never felt the need to stop and rest. Naturally we wanted to understand fully the effort required to get back up the ladder into the LM, so before we committed ourselves to lunar work I practiced that slight jump up the last long step. I was a little hesitant at first to apply a lot of force, but after a couple of tries I found that it was in fact quite easy. Near the end it was easy to apply enough force to go several steps up the ladder with one jump.

Technically the most difficult task I performed on the surface was driving those core samplers into the ground to get little tubes of lunar material for study. For such a soft, powdery surface, there is significant and surprising resistance just a few inches down. In no way did this suggest a hard force like a buried rock. It was just a gradual hardening of the subsurface which developed about five or six inches down. Now another surprising thing is that this resistance is not accompanied by a strong supporting force on the sides. I would meet resistance trying to push the core sampler down into the ground, into the subsurface, but that same material would not support the tube on the sides. It kept tipping back and forth from one side to another. Neil and I noticed the same thing when we tried to put the flagstaff in.

What this meant, quite simply, was that I had to hold onto the top of the core tube extension continually while I was hitting it with the hammer to drive it down into the ground. I actually missed once or twice. It wasn't a question of visibility. In bringing the hammer down I tended to disturb my own body position and my balance, as I was leaning over and using the core tube partly to support myself. When a striking motion with one hand disturbed my balance, it made me simultaneously move the core tube. And the hammer missed the top of the extension handle.

One explanation for the strange degree of resistance in lunar material may be that, having already been compressed by the lack of any atmosphere, it has been continually pounded by meteorites. This pounding probably has compacted that lower material much further, to a point where any additional compacting—like that of forcing a cutting tool and tube through it—requires significant applications of force. The material when I finally drew it out appeared to me to have a moist consistency in the way it adhered to the core tube.

It was a unique, almost mystical environment up here. Neil and I are both fairly reticent people, and we don't go in for free exchanges of sentiment. Even during our long training we didn't have many free exchanges. In contrast to that there was a moment on the moon, a brief moment, in which we sort of looked at each other and slapped each other on the shoulder—that was about the only space available—and said, "We made it. Good show," or something like that. I don't believe any pair of people have ever been more removed physically from the rest of the world than we were, nor at the same time so closely bound to it by all people back here who maintained liaison with us and who were so closely involved in helping us get there and back.

We didn't know the President was going to telephone us on the moon until about 10 seconds before it happened. At that point the ground told us to move over in the vicinity of the flag. Then we heard the President. Being able to salute that flag was one of the more humble yet proud experiences I've ever had. To be able to look at that American flag and know how much so many people had put of themselves and their work into getting it where it was. We sensed—we really did—this almost mystical unification of all the people in the world at that moment.

Before the flight Neil and I had discussed the timing of our EVA, and we had the option—with ground concurrence—of doing it either after a brief sleep period or before. We agreed that splitting up a sleep period was not the most attractive way to program ourselves, and going out early meant a long period without rest. Since we were not tired at that point, we decided to sleep after our EVA. Our success in that was less than optimum. In a word, we slept badly. I had the more advantageous location, on the floor of the LM. Neil worked out a position leaning back against the aft part of the cabin, essentially lying on the ascent engine cover. In order to keep his feet up, he rigged up a strap around a vertical bar so it formed a hammock for his feet. Then he found that the earth was peering at him through the telescope. The telescope was in such a position that it had the earth in its field of view and it was like a big blue eyeball staring right at him.

The thing which really kept us awake, however, was the temperature. It was very chilly in there. After about three hours it became unbearable. We had the liquid cooling system in operation in our suits, of course, and we tried to get comfortable by turning the water circulation down to minimum. That didn't help much. We turned the temperature control on our oxygen system down to minimum. That didn't have much effect either. We could have raised the window shades and let the light in to warm us, but that would have destroyed any remaining possibility of sleeping.

The light was sometimes annoying because when it struck our helmets from a side angle it would enter the face plate and make a glare which reflected all over it. Then when we entered a shadow, we would see reflections of our own faces in the front of the helmet and they obscured anything else that was to be seen. Once my face went into shadow it took maybe 20 seconds before my pupils dilated out again and I could see details.

As we deployed our experiments on the surface we had to jettison things like lanyards, retaining fasteners, etc., and some of these we tossed away. The objects would go away with a slow, very, very lazy motion. If anyone tried to throw a baseball back and forth in that atmosphere he would have difficulty at first acclimatizing himself to that slow, lazy trajectory, but I believe he could adapt to it quite readily.

It was surprising to me how much at home I felt in Eagle because of all the simulations we had done back at home. The view of the moon from the surface and the EVA itself have much less reality to me now than have those familiar operations inside Eagle. When we looked out the windows for the first time it just looked comfortable. As if you could almost go out in your shirtsleeves and get a suntan out there. I remember thinking, "Gee, if I didn't know where I was, I could believe that somebody had created this environment somewhere out in the West and given us another simulation to work in."

Inside our suits and helmets we could smell nothing on the surface, but when we got back into Eagle and got our helmets off we could. Odor is very subjective, but to me there was a distinct smell to the lunar material, pungent like gunpowder or spent cap-pistol caps. We carted a fair amount of lunar dust back inside the vehicle with us, either on our suits and boots or on the conveyor system we used to get boxes and equipment back inside. We noticed the odor right away.

Then the particles started finding little homes for themselves in the flooring or the suits, rubbing up against things. Once we lifted off again and were in zero gravity we expected to see these particles emerge and float around. We didn't exactly expect a dust storm, but we certainly expected a considerable amount of it floating up from the floor and out of nooks and crannies. Surprisingly, it never did. We were able to go ahead and take off our helmets and gloves without worrying about getting dust in our eyes.

It is difficult for me now to articulate my thoughts about the significance of this flight. On the surface it was three people on a voyage, but it was much more than that. It was more than a team of people and government and industry working together.

Man was destined to land on the moon sooner or later. The challenge has been there ever since man first looked at the moon, and it was inevitable that he would accept the challenge. The symbolism of the fight—of what we were looking for, of what I was interested in—seemed to transcend modern times. I searched for some words, or some symbol, to be representative of man's expanding search. I talked it over with my pastor, the Rev. Dean Woodruff of Webster Presbyterian Church, and we tried to work out on paper something which would have universal appeal. We were never quite able to do it, and I was a little disappointed in this.

I was able to serve myself communion on the moon. At a service at home two weeks before flight time, Dean Woodruff had celebrated a special communion for our flight. After the service, he gave me a miniature wine chalice which I had stowed in the LM with a small amount of bread and wine. Just after Mike had passed over us one revolution after our landing, when we knew we were going to be on the moon for a while, I unstowed these elements and put them on a little table I had in front of the abort guidance-system computer. During my requested air-to-ground silence I then read some passages from the Bible and celebrated communion.

I would like to have observed just how the wine poured in that environment, but it wasn't important how it got in the cup. It was important only to get it there. I offered some private prayers, but I find now that thoughts, feelings, come into my memory instead of words. I was not so selfish as to include my family in those prayers at the moment, nor so spacious as to include the fate of the world. I was thinking more about our particular task, and the challenge and the opportunity that had been given us. I asked people to offer thanks in their own way, and it is my hope that people will keep this whole event in their minds and see beyond minor details and technical achievements to a deeper meaning behind it all: challenge, a quest, the human need to do these things and the need to recognize that we are all one mankind, under God.

I Rattled Around in My Mini-Cathedral

(By Michael Collins)

Trying to cram eight days and nearly 500,000 miles into a couple of columns of print is a formidable job. I saw many things which human eyes are rarely privileged to see. But of all these it was the most wonderful thing to see Eagle coming up from the surface of the moon. I really got excited then because for the first time it was clear that they had done it. They had landed on the moon and got off again.

It was a nice, clear, crisp lunar day, if there is such a thing. The moon didn't look sinister or forbidding, as it can at very low sun angles. But that day, with a high sun angle, it was a happy place. It also was a happy situation, because here was the LM, getting larger and larger, brighter and shinier, and right smack dab where it should have been. All the tricky parts of the rendezvous were over, and now all we had to do was dock and get home.

The computer, of course, had been telling me that everything was going well, but that's a rather impersonal message. It's not any substitute for being able to look out the window and really see Eagle fixed in the reticle pattern as if riding on railroad tracks.

The docking process begins when the two vehicles touch and the probe slides into the drogue. They're held together then by three tiny capture latches, and it's almost like tiny little paper clips holding together two vehicles, one of which weighs 30,000 pounds and the other 5,000. It's a tenuous grasp, To make the combination rigid you fire a little gas bottle that activates a plunger which literally sucks the two vehicles together. At this point the 12 captures latches fire mechanically and you are held together very strongly. That's the hard dock.

Just as I fired the charge on the gas bottle we got a quite abnormal oscillation in the yaw axis. We had 8 or 10 rather dubious seconds then, when I really thought we were outside the boundaries for a successful retract and that I was going to have to release the LM and go back and dock all over again. I could have done it, as there was plenty of fuel. I've heard that I said, "All hell broke loose." I don't remember saying that, but if it's on the transcript of communications, then I guess I did say it.

At any rate I instantly took action to correct the angle and so did Neil in Eagle. Together we returned the two vehicles to an in-line position. All this time the automatic retract cycle was in fact taking place, and we heard a loud bang, which is characteristic of those 12 big latches slamming home. And lo and behold we were docked, and it was all over.

The first thing I had to do then was get the tunnel cleared to remove the hatch and the probe and the drogue and to stow them. Then I floated up into the tunnel to greet them. I could see them both, those beady little eyes, up there in the LM, and it's terrible but I can't remember now which one of them was first to get back into Columbia with me. I met them both in the tunnel and we shook hands, hard, and that was it. I was glad to see them and they allowed as how they were happy to be back. They passed the rock boxes through to me and I handled them as if they were absolutely jam-packed with rare jewels, which in a sense they were.

The flight in general was just beautiful. I was a little surprised by the initial ride on Saturn V. It was rough for the first 15 seconds or so. I suppose Saturns are like people, in a way, no two are exactly the same. Ours seemed very *busy*. It was like a nervous lady driving her car down a narrow alleyway, unable to decide whether she's too far to the left or too far to the right, but she knows she's one and maybe the other. So she keeps jerking the wheel back and forth. I expect that when I examine the data I'll find that my heightened awareness of these tense moments has made me exaggerate outrageously. But that's the way it felt. After about 15 seconds it quieted down and the second stage was absolutely as smooth as glass. It had a sort of ethereal quality. You couldn't believe you had those big engines burning behind you.

Any flight like this is an extremely long, fragile daisy chain of events. The malfunction of any one of thousands of pieces of hardware on the way could ruin the remainder of the mission. Despite the fact that I had great confidence in each individual item of equipment, I was a little pessimistic about our chances to carry the whole thing off. I figured that any chain as long and as tenuous as this had to have a weak link. Believe me, I spent a lot of time before the flight worrying about that link. Could I be it? Could my training have neglected some vital bit of information? Or had I been properly exposed but simply forgetful?

By launch day I was convinced that I had taken all steps within reason to prepare myself, and I hoped that the thousands of others responsible for equipment preparation had done the same. Obviously they had, for the performance of the whole "stack" was nothing short of perfection.

People keep asking me if I was lonely up there in Columbia while Neil and Buzz were on the moon. I wasn't. I've been flying airplanes by myself for about 17 years, and the idea of being in a flying vehicle alone was in no way alarming. In fact, sometimes I prefer to be by myself.

I knew there were a number of things that could go wrong with the LM and some of them would require a good deal of rescue work on my part, but I really wasn't apprehensive about it. In Columbia I had a happy home. Its construction is almost like that of a miniature cathedral, the bell tower being the tunnel which goes up into the LM. We had to prepare for a possible extravehicular transfer to get the other two back, in case we were unable to dock properly. So I had removed the center couch and folded it up and stowed it underneath the left couch. This created a center aisle that gave me more volume than I needed, and I rattled around in my mini-cathedral, bumping into the nave and transept when I wasn't careful.

I never caught a glimpse of Eagle on the surface of the moon, but I could sometimes hear them. The LM on the surface of the moon is always pointed toward some point on earth and Neil and Buzz could always talk to the ground. But I was whizzing around and around, and out of each two-hour revolution I was on the backside where I couldn't talk to anybody anywhere for over 40 minutes. Then as soon as I came within sight of the earth, I could talk to the earth. But I still wasn't in sight of the LM because it was over the horizon. So on any one pass on the front side I had roughly an hour and 15 minutes that I could talk to the world, but only six or seven minutes when I could talk directly to the LM. Every time I'd come around after a silent period I'd be just like everybody down on the ground, asking, "What did they say? What did they say?"

The quarantine period was a little burdensome. We were really glad to hear that the mice stayed healthy and didn't pick up any moon bugs. I was standing by inside the quarantine area ready to give mouth-to-mouth resuscitation or anything else to keep them alive. I had always hoped that after the first landing they would decide quarantine isn't necessary, but I understand that it will continue at least for the first three or four landings.

From 60 miles up the moon changes color as the sun angle changes. As you go around you have dawn and then midday, dusk and darkness, and the cycle repeats each revolution. When you come over the area by dawn and by dusk, when the sun is slanting off the lunar surface at a very shallow angle, it is truly a gray world. The grays go from absolute pure black through charcoal gray to slate into light gray. That's what the crew of Apollo 8 reported. Apollo 10 thought it was brown. As you report the lunar noon, midday, with the sun at a high angle, brown it is. It changes from gray to brown and then back to gray again, so we were able to avoid contradicting either crew.

On my only previous space flight, Gemini 10, I was so busy that I couldn't even stop to register the amazing fact of being outside, floating around on the end of a tether. My attention was 100% riveted to the task to be done. This time, during the quieter moments of the flight, I really could do some thinking about it. I thought a lot about my family but beyond that I thought about the planet Earth and what a magnificent place to live it is, and how tranquil it looks from a great distance. I thought about how nice it would be to get back to planet Earth, and to see blue water for a change instead of this utterly sterile, vacuum world that I was going around and around. You know, there are planets and there are planets. I've only seen two of them, but there's absolutely no comparison between them. The moon is a fascinating place and I'm sure that, geologically, it's a little gem. But give me the earth anytime.

I hope that one of the by-products of the space program will be to use our technology to preserve and protect our planet, to let the people know what a wonderful place they have—one they must stop befouling. We're extremely lucky just to have the air to breathe and the ocean to cup in our hands and pour over our heads. It is both a tragedy and a hideous crime to allow filth and pollution to contaminate the waters, so that pouring them over your head is no longer a pleasure.

I prefer people to machinery but there are times when cold, inanimate objects deserve the affection, regard and esteem usually reserved for flesh and blood. July 24 was such a time, and Columbia such a machine. She had taken us across a hostile black void to an alien planet, then back again, serenely depositing us almost affectionately on the bluest of blue waters. It didn't seem just to leave her scorched carcass unceremoniously, gutted and unattended, without somehow trying to mark her, to set her apart.

That night on the *Hornet* I clambered back on board and, ballpoint in hand, stood navigation station, staring at the blank expanse of gray bulkhead. I couldn't think of words eloquent enough to describe my emotions but finally I wrote: "Spacecraft 107, alias Apollo 11, alias Columbia. The best ship to come down the line. God bless her."

JAMAICAN INDEPENDENCE: A TRIBUTE

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, thoughts of Jamaica usually bring to mind an idyllic setting, a tropical paradise replete with shimmering sand, the calm turquoise of the Caribbean occasionally punctuated by the distant beat of a Calypso band. Jamaica is this and more, for it takes more than the stuff that the travel agent's dreams are made of to make a nation, and looking beyond the scenery to the record of the past 7 years as an independent nation, it is more than fitting that we pause to commemorate Jamaica's independence day of August 6.

It is not uncommon for the majority of the developing nations to be plagued by a variety of economic ills. Jamaica has handled these problems wisely, providing incentives for the establishment of industry and the encouragement of foreign investment. Looking at the gross domestic product for the past year, the 9-percent increase over that of 1967 is a heartening indication of growth in this picturesque isle. In the last year alone, 16 manufacturing plants opened, many of them American based, plus a cable and wire plant that will produce for both the local market and for export. Further evidence of Jamaica's vigorous and expanding economy finds the value of exports on the rise by 13 percent, a step largely attributable to the over 30 percent increase in the level of investment of the previous year. Moreover, the 12 percent increase in the production of alumina in 1968, with total earnings from bauxite and alumina exports rising by 16 percent, prove Jamaica to be a member of the world market not to be taken lightly. Needless to say, the images conjured up by the name of Jamaica more than explain the some 350,000 visitors to the island in 1968, a 16-percent increase over 1967.

Nor has Jamaica focused only on her own 4,420 square miles. Within a month of her independence from Great Britain, she joined the Pan American Health Organization as her first contribution to inter-American cooperation. And the government of Prime Minister Hugh Shearer is to be commended for its recent decision to establish a new population nutrition unit as part of the Caribbean Food and Nutrition Institute at Kingston, where the worldwide Malaria Eradication Training Center is also located. In addition, her entry into the Organization of American States just last month holds promise to provide the organization with fresh ideas and tone, as well as the Oxford English accent.

As Jamaica enters her eighth year of independence, allow me to offer my congratulations on her record thus far; and to Prime Minister Shearer and Ambassador Edgarton Richardson, I extend my warmest wishes for continuing progress and peace.

ILLINOIS TAXPAYERS WOULD BENEFIT FROM FEDERAL-STATE TAX INCOME SHARING

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations held extensive hearings on the subject of funds for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies. The published hearings include a large number of tables which show how much money is allocated to each of the States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific for the fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970.

An analysis of these tables convincingly demonstrates that the people of Illinois are being shortchanged. During calendar 1967, which included the first 6 months of fiscal 1968, the total personal income for Illinois was $40,850 million, which was 6.5 percent of the $625,068 million total for all 50 States plus the District of Columbia.

The analysis which I have had prepared eliminated all of the abovementioned outlying possessions, thus leaving only the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Also eliminated were programs from which some States were not allocated funds. In almost every instance, the State of Illinois received considerably less than 6 percent, the amount being less than 2 percent in a number of cases. From a couple of programs, the amount exceeded 7 percent—otherwise there was no program from which Illinois got as much as 6 percent.

It is obvious that my State would be better off if these programs were returned to the State and local levels. Accompanying such a shift should be a comparable reduction in Federal taxes. It would be up to the individual States to increase their own taxes where necessary. Certainly an Illinois taxpayer would be better off paying a dollar to the State of Illinois than a dollar and a half to the National Government.

Perhaps some of my colleagues will want to prepare similar tabulations for their own States in order to determine whether they, too, are being shortchanged.

The appropriations bill for Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies, as passed by this body, provided a total of $17,573,600,000, an increase of $922,600,000 over the amount reported by the Committee on Appropriations. I voted against the increase and against the bill on final passage, as I felt that the $16,651 million provided by the committee should have been cut rather than increased.

If the other body raises the total even further, I hope that the House of Representatives will refuse to agree to such increases. The people of Illinois are being shortchanged enough already.

The analysis to which I referred follows:

Programs	Fiscal year	United States	Illinois	Illinois, percent
Manpower development qnd training activities other than job opportunities in the business sector and concentrated employment program	1968	$288,956,536	$12,076,644	4.2
Manpower development and training activities—Institutional training allotment	1969	172,771,000	9,311,000	5.4
Manpower development and training activities—On-the-job training allotment	1969	36,377,000	1,115,000	3.1
Manpower development and training activities—Institutional training obligations	1969	146,762,235	8,501,149	5.8
Comprehensive manpower program planning activities	1970	5,321,300	135,000	2.5
Manpower development and training activities—State agency program services, employment security agencies	1970	42,521,000	3,085,000	7.3
Manpower development and training activities—State Agency program services, vocational education agencies	1970	7,890,000	367,000	4.7
Grants for construction of community mental health centers	1968	29,395,182	1,406,652	4.8
Ibid	1969	29,393,482	1,403,169	4.8
Ibid	1970	28,609,987	1,364,988	4.8
Grants for comprehensive State health planning	1968	4,519,000	174,400	3.9
Ibid	1969	6,946,900	270,100	3.9
Ibid	1970	7,700,600	299,900	3.9
Grants for comprehensive public health services	1968	58,495,600	2,547,200	4.4
Ibid	1969	63,709,800	2,719,800	4.3
Ibid	1970	87,230,400	3,887,900	4.5
Construction and modernization of hospitals and related health facilities:				
Modernization	1968	69,469,866	2,133,226	3.1
Ibid	1969	51,359,105	2,358,136	4.6
Ibid	1970	16,139,387	673,794	4.2
Hospitals and public health centers	1968	110,590,377	4,228,588	3.8
Ibid	1969	115,589,179	4,064,975	3.5
Ibid	1970	32,125,797	1,072,802	3.3
Long-term care facilities	1968	53,034,050	2,257,569	4.3
Ibid	1969	64,669,252	2,257,952	3.5
Ibid	1970	67,713,838	2,346,123	3.5
Rehabilitation facilities	1968	9,746,376	264,379	2.7
Ibid	1969	9,226,131	314,434	3.4
Ibid	1970	9,648,196	326,971	3.4
Diagnostic or treatment centers	1969	18,447,414	628,691	3.4
Ibid	1970	19,296,391	653,941	3.4
Assistance for educationally deprived children:				
Grants to State and local educational agencies	1968	1,141,175,120	47,565,775	4.2
Ibid	1969	1,078,550,359	44,407,826	4.1
Ibid	1970	1,178,226,377	46,736,723	4.0
Administration	1968	13,680,672	474,998	3.5
Ibid	1969	13,106,481	444,130	3.4
Ibid	1970	14,018,393	467,367	3.3
Elementary and secondary education:				
Supplementary educational centers and services	1968	178,078,330	9,382,000	5.3
Ibid	1969	159,929,720	8,223,590	5.1
Ibid	1970	112,901,210	5,650,541	5.0
School library resources	1968	96,852,597	5,337,276	5.5
Ibid	1969	48,780,049	2,681,475	5.5
Ibid	1970	40,975,610	2,252,460	5.5
National Defense Education Act—Guidance, counseling, and testing	1968	24,107,774	1,283,562	5.3
Ibid	1969	16,702,500	894,406	5.4
Ibid	1970	11,748,000	622,243	5.3
National Defense Education Act—Grants to States for equipment and minor remodeling	1968	74,020,160	3,039,031	4.1
Ibid	1969	73,905,800	3,067,510	4.2
National Defense Education Act—State administration of grants for equipment and minor remodeling	1968	1,968,000	102,071	5.2
Ibid	1969	1,965,000	99,990	5.1
Instructional assistance in the arts and humanities	1968	429,565	17,611	4.1
Ibid	1969	430,000	17,847	4.2
Strengthening State departments of education	1968	24,673,996	1,013,556	4.2
Ibid	1969	27,697,250	1,056,099	3.8
Ibid	1970	27,697,250	1,056,099	3.8
Education professions development—Elementary, secondary and other education personnel, grants to States for recruitment and training	1969	14,550,000	619,473	4.3
Ibid	1970	14,550,000	619,473	4.3
Land-grant colleges and universities	1968	14,244,154	439,618	3.1
Ibid	1969	14,297,254	435,726	3.0
Higher education—Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources, television equipment	1968	$1,482,770	$66,341	4.5
Ibid	1969	1,488,045	64,956	4.4
Higher education—Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources, other equipment	1968	12,870,459	574,954	4.5
Ibid	1969	12,896,388	562,951	4.4
Public community colleges and public technical institutes	1969	81,981,163	3,299,943	4.0
Ibid	1970	42,368,186	1,706,263	4.0
Other undergraduate institutions	1968	209,779,387	10,439,144	5.0
Ibid	1969	131,734,637	6,640,145	5.0
Ibid	1970	86,120,837	4,340,960	5.0
Higher education, construction, State Administration	1968	2,436,151	102,040	4.2
Ibid	1969	2,869,607	102,040	3.6
Ibid	1970	2,869,607	102,040	3.6
Higher education, construction, State planning	1968	3,345,950	142,272	4.3
Ibid	1969	2,646,767	112,980	4.3
Ibid	1970	2,940,850	125,534	4.2
Higher education, educational opportunity grants	1968	135,483,920	6,429,725	4.7
Ibid	1969	53,719,337	2,662,193	5.0
Ibid	1970	70,994,472	3,518,305	5.0
Higher education—National Defense Education Act, direct loans, contributions to loan funds	1968	177,426,076	9,041,649	5.1
Ibid	1969	188,923,517	9,619,251	5.1
Ibid	1970	153,923,199	7,628,040	5.0
Higher education, insured loans, advances for reserve funds	1969	12,194,240	642,626	5.3
College work-study programs	1968	133,038,599	5,129,105	3.9
Ibid	1969	142,590,000	6,321,681	4.4
Ibid	1970	149,410,800	6,624,079	4.4
Vocational education, basic grants, grants to States	1968	194,547,894	8,266,810	4.2
Ibid	1969	194,421,828	8,170,538	4.2
Ibid	1970	232,963,667	9,870,472	4.2
Vocational education, grants to States, George-Barden and Supplemental Acts	1968	48,163,149	2,130,336	4.4
Ibid	1969	48,175,714	2,130,336	4.4
Vocational education, consumer and homemaking education	1970	14,699,885	622,822	4.2
Vocational education, cooperative education	1970	13,580,000	374,227	2.8
Vocational education, innovation	1970	12,610,000	324,227	2.6
Public library services	1968	34,385,280	1,746,355	5.1
Ibid	1969	34,385,280	1,746,355	5.1
Ibid	1970	17,129,644	776,280	4.5
Interlibrary cooperation	1968	2,030,781	47,539	2.3
Ibid	1969	2,198,752	48,925	2.2
Ibid	1970	2,198,752	48,925	2.2
State institutional library services	1968	1,824,000	38,000	2.1
Ibid	1969	2,014,959	39,509	2.0
Ibid	1970	2,014,959	39,509	2.0
Library services for physically handicapped	1968	1,120,985	23,750	2.1
Ibid	1969	1,288,805	25,776	2.0
Ibid	1970	1,288,805	25,776	2.4
Construction of public libraries	1968	27,053,171	656,395	2.4
Ibid	1969	8,955,950	354,115	4.0
Ibid	1970	8,955,950	354,115	4.0
University community service program	1968	9,612,799	359,848	3.7
Ibid	1969	9,338,934	333,347	3.6
Ibid	1970	9,338,934	333,347	3.6
Adult basic education	1968	29,978,200	1,221,492	4.1
Ibid	1969	35,280,000	1,460,494	4.1
Ibid	1970	39,200,000	1,633,780	4.2
Education for the handicapped—Preschool and school programs	1968	13,834,951	687,167	5.0
Ibid	1969	28,398,058	1,488,885	5.2
Ibid	1970	28,398,058	1,488,885	5.2
Research and training in vocational education	1970	1,025,000	32,100	3.1
Grants to States for medical assistance	1968	1,817,929,895	83,557,694	4.6
Ibid	1969	2,336,319,000	94,293,000	4.0
Ibid	1970	2,800,391,000	107,479,000	3.8
Old-age assistance	1968	1,135,647,141	21,617,753	1.9
Ibid	1969	1,202,735,000	22,724,000	1.9
Ibid	1970	1,438,262,000	34,322,000	2.4
Aid to the blind	1968	51,610,001	1,052,550	2.0
Ibid	1969	53,884,000	1,105,000	2.1
Ibid	1970	60,333,000	1,156,000	1.9
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	1968	365,798,845	17,812,381	4.9
Ibid	1969	433,366,000	21,854,000	5.0
Ibid	1970	521,994,000	25,596,000	4.9
Aid to families with dependent children	1968	1,387,994,020	73,576,152	5.3
Ibid	1969	1,720,204,000	78,065,000	4.5

Programs	Fiscal year	United States	Illinois	Illinois, percent
Ibid	1970	$1,911,138,000	$84,209,000	4.4
Social services and administration	1968	457,879,992	16,677,320	3.6
Ibid	1969	584,646,000	28,464,000	4.9
Ibid	1970	713,268,000	39,862,000	5.6
Federal allotments—Basic support program—Sec. 2, Vocational Rehabilitation Act	1968	387,910,347	13,575,961	3.5
Ibid	1960	485,006,890	16,911,199	3.5
Ibid	1970	485,010,634	16,773,529	3.5
Federal grants—basic support program—Sec. 2, Vocational Rehabilitation Act	1968	283,381,491	12,500,000	4.4
Ibid	1969	342,417,000	14,500,000	4.2
Ibid	1970	461,364,628	16,649,201	3.6
Grants and allotments for innovation of vocational rehabilitation services	1969	3,110,991	157,554	5.1
Ibid	1970	3,111,378	157,153	5.1
Construction of community facilities for the mentally retarded	1968	11,764,991	512,877	4.4
Ibid	1969	$11,761,738	$513,046	4.4
Ibid	1970	7,890,135	303,324	3.8
Grants for research and training programs—Secs. 4 and 7, Vocational Rehabilitation Act—Training and Traineeships	1968	30,762,900	2,177,700	7.1
Ibid	1969	29,559,900	2,134,900	7.2
Maternal and child health services—Formula funds	1968	38,719,921	1,346,031	3.5
Ibid	1969	38,458,810	1,317,776	3.4
Ibid	1970	38,516,526	1,326,856	3.4
Crippled children's services—Formula funds	1968	39,793,092	1,316,697	3.3
Ibid	1969	44,455,334	1,504,926	3.4
Ibid	1970	45,219,738	1,518,568	3.4
Child welfare services	1968	44,779,117	1,850,707	4.1
Ibid	1969	44,758,741	1,867,121	4.2
Ibid	1970	44,711,904	1,856,374	4.2

INTRODUCTION OF COMPREHENSIVE NARCOTIC ADDICTION AND DRUG ABUSE CARE AND CONTROL ACT OF 1969

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today, for appropriate reference, a comprehensive bill to deal with many aspects of the Nation's rapidly growing drug problem.

With one important exception, my bill is identical with S. 2608, introduced on July 14 by the distinguished Senator from Texas, Mr. YARBOROUGH. My honorable colleague from California, Mr. CHARLES WILSON, introduced the Yarborough bill in the House, unaltered, on July 15, and reintroduced it, with 22 cosponsors on July 28. My bill differs from theirs only by specific reference to the classification or regulation of marihuana.

Not long ago, drugtaking was confined to hospitals and to the back alleys of our most neglected slums. Even then, of course, addiction was a complex disease, a pathology not simply biological, but also psychological and social. We understood it then even less than we do today, but that ignorance was somewhat excusable: The problem then was marginal, almost exotic.

Lamentably, this is no longer the case. Today we are well on our way to becoming a nation of drugtakers.

The use of addictive drugs such as heroin, cocaine, and opium, has spread rapidly. Addiction now claims about 100,000 victims, as compared with about 60,000 several years ago. But the really dramatic advance has been on new fronts: This decade has seen the rise of household drugs and drugs of rebellion. Though unscientific, these categories are useful, for they reflect a distinction commonly made by the society at large.

The household drugs are generally taken by worried or harassed citizens of middle age who consider themselves normal in all respects. According to Dr. Stanley Yolles, director of the National Institute of Mental Health, sedatives and tranquilizers, usually with an amphetamine or barbituate base, are used in excess by 200,000 to 400,000 Americans. In a few years, these figures will surely be an underestimate; the abuse of depressant and stimulant drugs is rapidly becoming part of our frenetic way of life.

Simultaneously, many of those unhappy with that way of life, typically the young and well-educated, have adopted the hallucinogenic drugs as a badge of rebellion. Our figures on these drugs are very unreliable, but conservative estimates suggest that at least 5 million persons have taken marihuana once or more. Among these are between 20 and 40 percent of our college students. About 5 percent have experimented with LSD or its more potent cousins.

On the horizon hover whole families of even more extraordinary substances. Scientists now rather casually mention the possibility of drugs which will enhance or obliterate memory, which will induce blissful contentment, unquestioning acquiescence, or anxious awareness. We may one day have the chemical knowledge to alter an individual's genes. The moral, social, and legal problems suggested by these possibilities stagger the imagination, but almost no one is thinking seriously about them. Too many scientists still think their responsibility ends at the laboratory bench; too many of us in public life refuse even to consider a problem until it reaches catastrophic proportions.

Today's delay of course sets the stage for tomorrow's panic. Even now, we have our fair share of hysteria. Parents are asking for draconian drug legislation and, simultaneously, pleading with the police to go easy on the drug infractions of their own children. Superficially strident and demanding, the public mood is actually very confused and contradictory. And no wonder: Our laws are archaic and inconsistent, and our knowledge of the use and abuses of drugs remains pathetically thin. We are all arguing in a factual vacuum, a procedure guaranteed to produce shrill and meaningless echoes.

My bill deals with research, treatment and education. Designed to gather knowledge and to disseminate it rapidly throughout the country, it would provide an early warning system for drugs and a rescue operation for those who foolishly ignored the warnings in the past.

This bill does not aim at altering our drug laws, which is a necessary, but separate, task. My bill is hardly a substitute for the writing of new and consistent penal statutes in the drug area. But neither are criminal statutes a substitute for the bill I am introducing today. For at least three broad reasons, penalties alone will never eradicate the drug menace:

First, drug abuse is already rampant in the face of rather stringent State and Federal sanctions; the deterrent power of law is clearly less than absolute in this area.

Second, for many drugs we have insufficient knowledge to write an intelligent penal statute. If it does not match the crime, the law will meet with contempt, not respect; it will be evaded, not obeyed.

Third, and most important, no criminal law can help the thousands of citizens whose lives have already been cruelly transformed by drugs.

My bill attacks those aspects of the drug abuse phenomenon which are immune to legal sanctions.

It would amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to allow eligibility for Federal funding of operation and maintenance costs as well as construction and staffing expenses.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants, at the recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, for research, personnel training, educational materials, and evaluation surveys relevant to the drug abuse problem. Section 302(a) of the Public Health Service Act would be amended to allow studies of depressant and stimulant drugs, as well as narcotics.

The bill would establish regional research centers for the study of drug abuse, one of which would become a National Addiction and Drug Abuse Center.

Finally, my bill would give the Secretary of HEW, in consultation with a new and expert committee, the authority to designate substances as depressant or stimulant drugs and to control the medical and scientific uses of narcotics and depressant or stimulant drugs. I regard this as a very important provision; its adoption would indicate that we understand the fundamental nature of the drug menace threatening this country. The drug problem, largely and increasingly, is a public health problem. It should therefore largely fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Yarborough-Wilson bill, on which mine is modeled, would remove marihuana regulation from the Internal Revenue Code and include the drug under the definition of depressant for stimulant substances in the Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act, thus making marihuana subject to the penalties and controls imposed on such substances. As noted, I have deleted this provision in introducing my bill. My reason is simple: nowhere else in the legislation is there specific reference to a particular drug or to the complex issue of penalties. Whatever its merits, the marihuana provision would unnecessarily complicate the bill.

I do not doubt that we shall soon deal with the regulation of marihuana, for the Supreme Court has recently voided key provisions of the extant Federal legislation on that subject. But this issue promises a long and heated debate. There is no reason to carry it out within the context of a bill designed for other purposes.

The drug problem has many facets. Only if they are kept clearly distinct will they submit to rational analysis.

I now submit the full text of my bill for my colleagues' information:

H.R. 13561

A bill to provide for a comprehensive and coordinated attack on the narcotic addiction and drug abuse problem, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Comprehensive Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse Care and Control Act of 1969."

DECLARATION OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 2 (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) Narcotic addiction and drug abuse are major health and social problems afflicting a significant proportion of the public, and much more needs to be done by public and private agencies to develop effective prevention and control.

(2) Narcotic addiction and drug abuse treatment and control programs should whenever possible: (A) be community based, (B) provide a comprehensive range of services, including emergency treatment, under proper medical auspices on a coordinated basis, and (C) be integrated with and involve the active participation of a wide range of public and nongovernmental agencies.

(3) There is an urgent need to educate young people and the public in general on the abuse of drugs and that insufficient manpower currently are available to undertake such educational programs.

(4) There is a serious shortage of professional and other personnel trained to work more effectively in relation to the prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction and drug abuse.

(5) Current knowledge regarding the causes, prevention, and treatment of narcotic addiction and drug abuse are inadequate.

(b) In order to preserve and protect the health and welfare of the American people in meeting these needs, it is the purpose of this Act to authorize the Secretary of Helath, Education, and Welfare to establish a program of grants and contracts for the construction, staffing, operation, and maintenance of facilities for the prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction and drug abuse, for the development of narcotic addiction and drug abuse education programs, for the training of professional and other personnel, for the conduct of appropriate study, research, and experimentation, and for the creation of appropriate demonstration projects relating to narcotic addiction and drug abuse.

TITLE I—CONSTRUCTION, STAFFING, AND OPERATION OF TREATMENT FACILITIES

Sec. 101. (a) Sections 242 (a), 243 (a) and 251 (a) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act are each amended by striking out "of compensation of professional and technical personnel for the initial operation" and inserting in lieu thereof in each such section "of operation, staffing, and maintenance".

(b) Section 242 (b) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Grants under subsection (a) for the costs of operation, staffing, and maintenance of a facility may be made only for the first eight years that such facility is in operation and the amount of any such grant shall not exceed 90 per centum of such costs for the first two years of the grant and 75 per centum of such costs for each of the next six years."

(c) Section 243 (c) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Grants made under subsection (a) for the costs of operation, staffing, and maintenance may not exceed the percentages of such costs, and may be made only for the period, prescribed for grants for such costs under section 242."

(d) Section 251(b) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended by striking out "in excess of 66⅔ per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "in excess of 90 per centum".

(e) Section 251(c) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Grants under subsection (a) for the costs of operation, staffing, and maintenance of a facility may be made only for the first eight years that such facility is in operation and the amount of any such grant shall not exceed 90 per centum of such costs for the first two years of the grant and 75 per centum of such costs for each of the next six years."

(f) Section 261(a) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1972; $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; for construction, operating, staffing, and maintenance grants under parts C or D. Sums so appropriated for any fiscal year shall remain available for obligation until the close of the next fiscal year."

(g) Section 261 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended by striking out subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) There are also authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each of the next eleven fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to continue to make grants for staffing with respect to any project under part C or D for which a staffing, operation and maintenance grant was made from appropriations under subsection (a) of this section for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, through 1975.

"(c) For purposes of parts C and D, the term 'staffing' means salaries, fringe benefits, and travel allowances for professional, technical, and support personnel needed to provide services to administer, evaluate, operate, and maintain the facilities and program of a treatment center.

"(d) For purposes of parts C and D, the term 'operation and maintenance' means upkeep and repairs, supplies utilities, rent, equipment cleaning, food and drugs, and similar items of cost incurred by a treatment facility."

TITLE II—TRAINING AND EVALUATION, AND DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

SEC. 201. (a) Section 252 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended to read as follows:

"TRAINING AND EVALUATION

"SEC. 252. (a) For the purpose of assisting in overcoming the critical shortage of scientific and professional personnel trained to deal with drug abuse and addiction, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to States and political subdivisions thereof and to public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations, and to enter into contracts with other private agencies and organizations, for—

"(1) the development of specialized training programs or materials relating to the provision of health services for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse;

"(2) the development of inservice or short-term refresher courses with respect to the provision of such services;

"(3) training personnel to operate, supervise, and administer such services;

"(4) the conduct of a program of research and study relating to (A) personnel practices and current and projected personnel needs in the field of drug abuse (including prevention, control, treatment, and rehabilitation), (B) the availability and adequacy of the educational and training resources of individuals in, or preparing to enter, such field, and (C) the availability and adequacy of specialized training for persons such as physicians and other health professionals who have occasion to deal with drug addicts, including the extent to which such persons make the best use of their professional qualifications when dealing with such persons; and

"(5) the conduct of surveys and field trials to evaluate the adequacy of the programs for the prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction within the several States with a view to determining ways and means of improving, extending, and expanding such programs.

"(b) Training grants under this section may be made only upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council. Such grants may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary.

"(c) As used in this section, the term 'professional personnel' shall include, but not be limited to, persons in the field of medicine, psychiatry, nursing, social work, psychology, education, and vocational rehabilitation.

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions of this section $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

SEC. 202. The Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended by redesignating sections 253 and 254 as sections 255 and 256, respectively, and by inserting after section 252 the following new sections:

"FELLOWSHIP GRANTS

"SEC. 253. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make fellowship grants to professional personnel for training in relation to drug addiction and other drug-abuse-related problems. Each applicant for a fellowship shall present a plan for his training which includes appropriate information regarding the participation of the institutions or agencies who will be providing the training.

"(b) Training grants under this section may be made only upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council. Such grants may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary.

"(c) As used in this section, the term 'professional personnel' shall include, but not be limited to, persons in the fields of medicine, psychiatry, nursing, social work, psychology, education and vocational rehabilitation.

"(d) The term 'fellowship' grant shall include such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as the Secretary may deem necessary.

"(e) Training and fellowship awards under this section shall be made at such levels as may be required to facilitate the recruitment of the necessary professional manpower to this high priority area.

"(f) There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purpose of this section $400,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $600,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; and $1,000,000 for each of the next three fiscal years.

"DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

"SEC. 254. (a) The Secretary is authorized to makke grants to States and political subdivisions thereof and to public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations, and to enter into contracts with other private agencies and organizations, for—

"(1) the collection, preparation, and dissemination of educational materials dealing with the use and abuse of drugs and the prevention of drug abuse, and

"(2) the development and evaluation of programs of drug abuse educations directed at the general public, school-age children, and special high-risk groups.

"(b) The Secretary, acting through the National Institute of Mental Health, shall (1) serve as a focal point for the collection and dissemination of information related to drug abuse; (2) collect, prepare, and disseminate materials (including films and other educational devices) dealing with the abuse of drugs and the prevention of drug abuse; (3) provide for the preparation, production, and conduct of programs of public education (including those using films and other educational devices); (4) train professional and other persons to organize and participate in programs of public education in relation to drug abuse; (5) coordinate activities carried on by such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government as he shall designate with respect to health education aspects of drug abuse; (6) provide technical assistance to State and local health and educational agencies with respect to the establishment and implementation of programs and procedures for public education on drug abuse; and (7) undertake other activities essential to a national program for drug abuse education.

"(c) The Secretary, acting through the National Institute of Mental Health, is authorized to develop and conduct workshops, institutes, and other activities for the training of professional and other personnel to work in the area of drug abuse education.

"(d) Grants under this section may be made only upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council.

'(e) There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of this section $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; and $8,000,000 for each of the next two fiscal years."

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT FOR RESEARCH AND STUDIES RELATING TO DRUG USE, ABUSE, AND ADDICTION

SEC. 301. (a) Section 302(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "depressant or stimulant drugs and" before "narcotics" in the first sentence;

(2) by striking out "the use and misuse of narcotic drugs," in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) the use and misuse of depressant or stimulant drugs and narcotic drugs, and (2)"; and

(3) by striking out "at his discretion" in the second sentence.

(b) Section 302 of the Public Health Service Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to establish a program of grants to be administered by the National Institute of Mental Health to—

"(1) support and conduct programs of research into all phases of drug use and abuse, including the origins, causes, incidence, and prevention of drug use and abuse, the abuse potential of drugs, and the therapeutic and rehabilitation agents and techniques;

"(2) make grants to State or local agencies and other public or nonprofit agencies and institutions, and to enter into contracts with any other agencies or institutions, for the conduct of investigations, experiments, demonstrations, studies, and research projects with respect to the development of improved methods of diagnosing drug addiction and abuse and of care, treatment, and rehabilitation of drug addicts and drug abusers;

"(3) make grants to State agencies responsible for administration of State institutions for care, or care and treatment, of drug addicts or abusers for developing and establishing improved methods of operation and administration of such institutions;

"(4) conduct surveys evaluating the adequacy of programs for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and for necessary planning studies;

"(5) develop field trials and demonstration programs for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse;

"(6) establish a National Registry of Narcotic Addicts to facilitate research in drug addiction; and

"(7) make project grants to State or local agencies and other public or nonprofit agencies or institutions for the establishment, construction, staffing, operation, and maintenance of regional centers for research in drug abuse and related problems, one of which centers shall be established as a National Addiction and Drug Abuse Research Center as part of the National Institute of Mental Health, and shall be located in close proximity to the central research facilities of such Institute so as to avoid duplication of basic science laboratories and to allow for exchange of scientific information in collaboration between researchers in these closely related areas.

Any information contained in the National Registry of Narcotic Addicts, established under paragraph (6), shall be used only for statistical and research purposes and no name or identifying characteristics of any person who is listed in the Registry shall be divulged without the approval of the Secretary and the consent of the person concerned except to personnel who operate the Registry. The Secretary may authorize persons engaged in research under this subsection on the use and effect of drugs to protect the privacy of individuals who are the subject of such research by withholding from all persons not connected with the conduct of such research the names or other identifying characteristics of such individuals. Persons so authorized to protect the privacy of such individuals may not be compelled in any Federal, State, civil, criminal, administrative, legislative, or other proceeding to identify such individuals.

"(d) The following amounts are authorized to be appropriated:

"(1) For carrying out the purpose of section 302(c) (1) through (6), $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

"(2) $15,000,000 for the establishment of the National Addiction and Drug Abuse Research Center. Sums appropriated under the preceding sentence shall remain available until expended. For carrying out the other purposes of section 302(c)(7), $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1974."

TITLE IV—CONTROL OF DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES

SEC. 401. (a) The Congress finds and declares that the importation, manufacture, distribution, possession, and use of narcotic drugs and depressant and stimulant drugs for nonmedical and nonscientific purposes have a substantial and detrimental effect on the health and general welfare of the American people, that the medical and scientific use of such drugs are important elements of the practice of medicine and of scientific research, and that adequate provision must be made to insure the availability of controlled drugs for such legitimate purposes.

(b) The Congress further finds that there is a need for a single comprehensive code which makes the necessary distinctions among narcotic drugs and depressant and stimulant drugs with respect to the degree of control required and between their medical and scientific use as against their abuse for nonmedical and nonscientific purposes. It is therefore the purpose of this title to provide for the establishment of such a code, by utilizing the medical and scientific expertise of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the particular competence and expertise of persons versed in the fields of mental health and pharmacology.

SEC. 402 .(a) In order to aid the States and communities, the medical and scientific professions, law enforcement authorities, and other concerned groups and individuals in coping with the problems of drug abuse, while at the same time encouraging ready access to certain substances for scientific, therapeutic, industrial, or other legitimate purposes, the Secretary shall—

(1) carry out the studies and investigations pertaining to narcotics and depressant and stimulant drugs as directed by section 302(a) of the Public Health Service Act;

(2) determine which substances should be subject to control because of their ability to produce physical or psychological dependence which could lead to abuse:

(3) place these substances in such classes and categories as he shall find necessary, ranked according to the extent of their ability to produce physical or psychological dependence and their relative capabilities for abuse;

(4) promulgate a list of all such substances classified or categorized as directed by paragraph (3); and

(5) amend such list from time to time by adding, deleting, or changing the classification or categorization of a substance as he shall find necessary in the light of new scientific knowledge.

(b) No substance may be included on such list unless it is a narcotic drug (as defined in section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code) or is a depressant or stimulant drug (as defined in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act) that is not exempted under section 511(f) of that Act.

(c) The initial list promulgated by the Secretary shall not take effect until after such list has been published in the Federal Register, and not less than thirty days shall have passed thereafter. If within such thirty-day period any person adversely affected by such listing shall require opportunity for a hearing, the Secretary shall provide for such hearing, in conformity with the procedures prescribed in section 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with judicial review available in conformity with such section. After such list shall have become final, any change in the category of any substance may be carried out by the Secretary only after similar notice, opportunity for a hearing, and opportunity for judicial review in conformity with such section 701.

SEC. 403. Before making any of the determinations required by section 402, the Secretary shall consider the advice of the Advisory Committee on Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, established by section 503 of this Act, and shall consult with the Attorney General.

REGISTRATION OF RESEARCH ESTABLISHMENTS

SEC. 404, Title V of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"REGISTRATION OF RESEARCH ESTABLISHMENTS

"SEC. 513. (a) No person may conduct any research project with any narcotic drug (as defined in section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) or with marihuana (as defined in section 4761 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) unless such research is conducted by an establishment currently registered by the Secretary under this section. Registration under this section shall be for one year periods, and shall be renewable for like periods.

"(b) (1) No establishment may be registered under this section except pursuant to application which shall set forth—

"(A) the name of the applicant;

"(B) his principal place of business;

"(C) the number or other identification of any applicable Federal, State, or local license or registration, relating to narcotic drugs or marihuana, currently held by the applicant including the number or other identification of any such Federal license or registration previously held by the applicant;

"(D) procedures for accountability for drugs used in research projects of the applicant and the methods to be used and the safeguards to be instituted against diversion of the drugs used in such projects to nonmedical or nonscientific uses; and

"(E) any other information required by the Secretary by regulations.

The Secretary may not register an establishment under this section unless he determines that the applicant has established adequate procedures to provide for accountability for drugs used in research projects of the applicant and adequate methods to safeguard against diversion of such drugs to nonmedical or nonscientific uses, in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Attorney General. Such regulations shall permit the conduct of double-blind studies.

"(2) Each applicant registered under this section shall, before any drugs are administered to human beings under a research project of the applicant, submit to the Secretary, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require, a research protocol, describing the research to be conducted, listing the investigators (each of whom must be registered under section 4722 or 4753 of the Internal Revenue Code, as applicable) and their qualifications to engage in such research, and otherwise conforming to the requirements of section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. No such research protocol may provide for the dispensing or administration of drugs to human beings except by persons licensed to dispense or administer such drugs under applicable State laws.

"(c) (1) The Secretary may revoke or suspend the registration of any establishment granted under this section if he finds (A) that the application for such registration contains any untrue statement of material fact, (B) that research projects in such establishment are not being conducted in accordance with approved procedures or methods relating to accountability for drugs or safeguards against diversion of drugs used in such project to nonmedical or nonscientific uses, or (C) research projects involving the dispensing or administration of drugs to human beings are being conducted by persons not licensed under applicable State law to dispense or administer drugs.

"(2) Regulations of the Secretary shall provide for notice and opportunity for a hearing before revocation or suspension of registration under this section, except that, upon a finding of imminent hazard to the public health, such registration may be suspended or revoked prior to such hearing, but opportunity for a hearing shall be granted immediately in such cases."

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO DRUG RESEARCH IN REGULATED ESTABLISHMENTS

SEC. 405. (a) Section 4704(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by inserting immediately below paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) RESEARCH.—To the dispensing or administration of narcotic drugs in the course of a research project conducted by an establishment currently registered under section 513 of the Public Health Service Act, if records of the drugs so dispensed or administered are kept as required by this subpart."

(b) Section 4705(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(5) RESEARCH.—To the dispensing or administration of narcotic drugs to any person in the course of a research project conducted by an establishment currently registered issued under section 513 of the Public Health Service Act. Such registrant shall keep a record of all such drugs dispensed or administered, showing the amount dispensed or administered, the date, and the name and address of the person to whom such drugs are dispensed or administered, except such as may be dispensed or administered to a patient upon whom a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner shall personally attend; and such record shall be kept for a period of two years from the date of dispensing or administering such drugs, subject to inspection, as provided in section 4773."

(c) Section 4721(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "research, instruction, or analysis" and inserting in lieu thereof "instruction or analysis, or for the purpose of research by an establishment currently registered under section 513 of the Public Health Service Act,".

(d) Section 4742(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(6) RESEARCH PROJECTS.—To a transfer of marihuana to or by a person in the conduct of a research project conducted by an establishment currently registered under section 513 of the Public Health Service Act. Such registrant shall keep a record of all such marihuana used in such project, showing the amount used and the name and address of the person using such marihuana, and such record shall be kept for a period of two years from the date of such use, and be subject to inspection as provided in section 4773."

(e) Section 4751(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "research, instruction, or analysis" and inserting in lieu thereof "instruction or analysis, or for the purpose of research by an establishment currently registered under section 513 of the Public Health Service Act".

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

TRANSFERS OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 501. The functions, powers and duties of the Attorney General under Reorganization Plan Number 1 of 1968 to designate a drug as a depressant or stimulant drug under section 201(v) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, to make a finding that a drug or other substance is an opiate under section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to determine the medical, scientific, and other legitimate needs of the United States for the purpose of establishing manufacturing quotas for narcotic drugs under section 509 of the Narcotics Manufacturing Act of 1960, and to determine the amounts of narcotic drugs that should be imported or exported under sections 2 and 6 of tne Act of February 9, 1909 (21 U.S.C. 173, 182) are transferred to the Secretary.

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO TRANSFERS OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 502. (a) The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 4702(a)(1) is amended by striking out "The Secretary or his delegate" where it appears after sub-paragraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(2) Sections 4702(a)(3) and 4702(a)(5) are each amended by striking out "The Secretary or his delegate" where it appears in those sections and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(3) Section 4705(c)(2)(C) is amended by striking out "The Secretary or his delegate" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(4) Sections 4731(g)(1) and 4731(g)(2) are each amended by striking out "The Secretary or his delegate (after considering the technical advice of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or his delegate, on the subject)" and inserting in lieu thereof in each such section "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(b) Section 2(b) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act is amended by striking out "the board" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(c) Section 10(a) of the Opium Poppy Control Act of 1942 (21 U.S.C. 188) is amended by striking out "The Secretary of the Treasury" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(d) The Narcotics Manufacturing Act of 1960 is amended as follows:

(1) The second sentence of section 5(b) (21 U.S.C. 503) is amended by striking out "The Secretary or his delegate" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(2) The second sentence of section 5(d) is amended by striking out "The Secretary

or his delegate" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(3) Section 6 (21 U.S.C. 504) is amended by striking out "The Secretary or his delegate" the first and third time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(4) Section 7(b) (21 U.S.C. 505(b)) is amended by striking out "if the Secretary or his delegate" and inserting in lieu thereof "if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(5) Paragraph (1) of Section 8(a) (21 U.S.C. 506(a)) is amended by striking out "which will produce" and inserting in lieu thereof "which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General, determines will produce".

(6) Section 11(a) (21 U.S.C. 509) is amended by striking out "the Secretary or his delegate" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

(7) Section 11(b) is amended by striking out "the Secretary or his delegate" the first time it appears in that section and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Attorney General".

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall appoint a committee of experts to advise him with respect to any of the determinations pertaining to drugs which he is required to make under amendments made by this Act. This committee shall be known as the Advisory Committee on Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. It shall be composed of not less than twelve persons of diverse professional backgrounds, including the fields of pharmacology, psychiatry, psychology and other behavioral sciences, manufacturing, and distribution, who, in the opinion of the Secretary, qualify as experts on the subject of narcotic drugs or depressant or stimulant drugs.

SAFEGUARD ABM

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, we have just recently witnessed the great debate and vote in the other body on the deployment of the Safeguard ABM system, but the issue has not yet been finally resolved. It will soon be placed before this body for consideration and vote. I, therefore, commend to my colleagues an excellent article on the subject which appeared in the August issue of the American Legion magazine, as follows:

HOW IMPORTANT IS MISSILE DEFENSE?

(NOTE.—A look at this year's big national debate on an anti-ballistic-missile system that has seen two Presidents clash with Congress over its need.)

(By R. B. Pitkin and Gerald L. Steibel)

As these words are written, a remarkable debate is coming to a head in Congress. The argument is: Should we have a system of missiles that can destroy enemy missiles in flight if they should be launched against us?

Such missiles are called ABMs in the current news jargon. That stands for "anti-ballistic missiles." They are also called BMDs (for ballistic missile defense). Whatever you call them, their function is not attack, but defense against enemy missiles.

A lot of laymen thought we had such missiles standing by a long time ago. But we do not. You may recall that Congress did approve a "thin" system of ABMs to ring some of our cities during President Johnson's last years in office. They were supposed to protect us from "Chinese" destructive missiles. However, not one of them exists or is apt to. There were at least two major problems with Johnson's "Sentinel" system, and what has been debated this year is President Nixon's "Safeguard" system, which should overcome the two main weaknesses of the older proposal. Yet, while Johnson's proposal was approved for one year, as we write these words not enough votes have been assured in the Senate to OK funds for 1969–70 to get going on Nixon's. Unless the Senate vote is delayed, you may know its outcome by the time you read this. If the vote is "no," then for at least another year we will be making no progress toward putting some clothes on our nakedness in the face of a missile attack against us. If it's "yes," then for at least the next year we'll be making headway.

A lot of the debate about ABMs is based on guesses about what the Soviets will do or can do. In fact, the most rational arguments against our having any ABMs stand almost entirely on such guesses. If the guesses are right, the arguments are reasonable up to a point (if you think it is reasonable for us to gamble our lives on guesses about the Soviets).

Other arguments against ABMs are not so respectable. One is that they won't work and can't be made to work. That is simply untrue. The Soviets tested one against a missile in flight in 1962, showed one off at a parade in Moscow in 1964 and since 1966 have been installing a whole system of them.

ABMs, as proposed by the Nixon Administration, are related to three possible levels of missile warfare—a small attack on us, a large attack on us or no attack on us.

The first level deals with what happens if a lone missile or two or three were fired at us. This could conceivably happen if one of those "fail safe" things occurred. Say an overeager Russian officer fires one or two at us in some crisis before his superiors can stop him. Or a small country get its hands on a few, as Cuba almost did, and sends one at us out of sheer recklessness.

What happens then? The way we are set up now we have 1,054 intercontinental ballastic missiles (ICBMS) in hardened land-based silos, and more than 650 submarine-based Polaris missiles—all weapons of destruction against people and cities. We can let loose destruction at the source of a lone missile and hope our counterblow gets through, but we can't knock that incoming missile down. Even if the hot line got to us in seconds and somehow persuaded us that a lone missile wasn't the start of the Big War, we'd still have to take that missile. If it were well aimed, we'd lose at least a whole city. We have nothing to destroy it in flight. Only an ABM can do that.

The second level is the other extreme. Another nation launches an all-out nuclear war against us. If we have by then (and it takes time) a good system of ABMs, what good would they be? Nobody has challenged the 1967 testimony of former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara that they might save from 80 million to 110 million lives—depending on how much we want to spend—if the projected loss of life without them is 120 million. This, of course, is a guess, but the only fault that has been found with it is that ABMs couldn't provide an "impenetrable shield," as McNamara put it, and save us from any damage at all. In fact, the rather loosely bandied claim that ABMs "won't work" is really based on the common knowledge that they couldn't make us immune to *all* damage. In honesty to our people it should be fairly stated that "won't work" could mean saving 80 million or more lives in the most intolerable of situations. Mr. McNamara, it should be noted, was not arguing for ABMs, but against them, based on his belief in 1967 that we should increase our offensive strength to discourage an all-out nuclear attack.

But he changed his position later, as did President Johnson and McNamara's immediate successor, Clark Clifford. And for good reason. By late 1967, the Russians had moved rapidly to cancel out the peacemaking power of our weapons as they were—and still are.

This brings us to the third level of nuclear possibilities, the level of so preparing ourselves that we need not fear an attack by anyone but a madman. (Though the ABMs might take care of the madman, too.) Our actual policy has long been based on having enough nuclear missile strength so that even if we were hit by surprise, we'd have enough undamaged missiles left to strike our attacker a mortal blow. That being so, he wouldn't dare strike the first blow, and there would never be a nuclear war.

Some years ago we halted the expansion of our land-based missiles at their present 1,054. Any more, it was adjudged, would just provide "overkill"—that is, the ability to do far more destruction to an attacker than would ever be needed to stay his hand.

If we genuinely do have "overkill" power, then, of course, it is senseless to keep on adding to our attack power. And (except for defense against an irrational attack) we have little need for ABMs because nobody is ever going to launch any missiles against us, or try to blackmail us with threats of having superior power. But do we still have assured "overkill" power?

Not everything that alarmed President Johnson, and then President Nixon, into seeking ABMs in a hurry, from 1967 on, is necessarily known. Dr. Edward Teller, the hydrogen-bomb expert, recently urged Congress to get an ABM program going on a year-to-year basis at least. He noted that time was running out to get a defense against launched missiles under way (it could take years), and he said in effect that Congress cannot safely keep postponing all action, in view of what is and is not known.

What is known? Chiefly that the Soviets have taken three major steps to offset the peacekeeping power of our attack missiles. Each step either gives them more offensive power, or tends to neutralize the threat of our weapons to deter them, or both.

First, they are greatly expanding the number and power of their missiles of attack. The London Institute for Strategic Studies estimates that the Soviets now have about 200 more land-based missiles than we do, and are on the way to installing about 2,500 of them in all (more than double ours in number). Some opponents of our ABM have tended to kiss this off as more "overkill"—that is, no matter how many they might build, the Russians still wouldn't dare launch them and couldn't threaten us with them. What our fewer missiles could do in retaliation is still enough to scare them out of starting anything.

If the number of the projected Soviet missiles seems like foolish "overkill," the enormous power of some of their individual warheads can easily be portrayed in the same way. Both the Soviet Union and the United States have been depending chiefly on one megaton warheads, which is 50 times the power of those we used in WW2 and more than enough to wipe out a city. Yet the Soviets are building from 400 to 500 SS–9 triple warheads, with from five to 25 megatons each—and Soviet warheads of 50 and 100 megatons appear to be on the way.

It is extremely costly for the Soviets to set up such great numbers of tremendously powerful missile-borne warheads, so it is dangerous for us to base our policy on a belief that they are just being stupid in creating so much more strength than they could possibly ever need. The expense they are going to argues that they have a clear purpose in mind.

Nixon's Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, gave the Senate Foreign Relations Committee his view of the meaning of all this. The numbers and the power of the Soviet missiles make no sense if undefended American cities are their targets. They are just waste power for any such mission. But they make sense if they are to be used in a first strike to annihilate our retaliatory missiles in their silos.

The great power of the SS-9s makes good sense if it is to be aimed at our Minutemen and our few Titans. Both sides bury their attack missiles in concrete-hardened clusters, in underground sites, where it almost takes a direct hit to knock them out of action. But as you step up the power of a warhead, you can be farther and farther off target from a direct hit and still destroy your foe's missiles in their silos—or wreck a whole cluster with one hit.

Laird's point was clear enough. If the Russians are building a flight of special weapons of enormous power to annihilate our strikeback power within the first few minutes of an attack, their respect for our missiles approaches zero as their confidence in wrecking them on the ground approaches 100. Meanwhile, in the absence of any American ABM system, only Russian error could keep all their SS-9s from getting through. Thus they are the sole judges of their chances of success, and our own power to deter them by owning undefended missiles becomes ever more imaginary.

Senate Foreign Relations Chairman J. William Fulbright (Ark.) said that he was sure the Soviets still feared our missiles enough to stay their hand, and he told Laird that Laird was just trying to scare Congress to death with his description of the SS-9s so that it would vote money for ABMs. This hardly seems fair to either Laird or the American people. If the Soviets are building superbombs capable of wrecking our retaliatory missiles on a previously impossible scale, it's Laird's duty as Defense Secretary to tell Congress and the people, and not hold back because the news is unpleasant.

Just what those SS-9s could do to wreck our missiles on the ground is, of course, guesswork. Nuclear physicist Ralph Lapp, who is a consultant to Nuclear Science Service in Washington, has been campaigning mightily against our setting up an ABM system. He contends that from half to three-fourths of our Minutemen would survive any blow that the Soviets could level at us by the mid-1970s, and about half of them would be able to hit back effectively. He means without any ABMs. That's enough to deter an attack on us, he suggests. Even if he's right, which is doubtful, his guess doesn't extend beyond seven or eight years from now. That's about when we could have a full ABM system operational if we start now. And that's when the Soviets could have over 400 SS-9s, at their present rate of installation.

Lapp's opposition to ABMs as a scientist is often hard to follow. Writing in the New York Times Magazine he took the position of a spokesman for the American people, which he simply is not. He professed that the people were up in arms against the ABM, though a Harris Poll that week showed 47% for ABMs, 26% against and 27% not sure.

The people were bound to be against the ABM, he said, because they were "wearied of the war in Vietnam, dismayed and disturbed by the North Korean capture of the intelligence ship *Pueblo* and resentful of the continued diversion of dollars from the domestic front to defense."

Since it wasn't really the people, but Lapp, who was talking, this is an excellent insight into the mind of one of several distinguished scientists who have diluted opposition to ABMs with emotional, irrelevant, non-scientific reasons. The *Pueblo*, the Vietnam war, hatred of the military or a desire to divert the funds to other causes hardly have a place in a discussion of whether we now need ABMs if we are to continue to maintain a stance that will prevent nuclear war.

If Lapp thinks most of our missiles would survive anything the Soviets could throw at them for some years hence without any more protection than earth and concrete, what do our responsible officials believe? Defense Department research chief John Foster contends that only a tenth—or about 100—of our land-based missiles would survive a Soviet attack by the SS-9s. Ordinary people have no way of judging who is right, or why there is that wide a gap between the thinking of two highly qualified men.

Foster has the responsibility, and, in the end, so does President Nixon, who plainly goes with Foster.

If Foster is right, the Soviets can expect us to launch 100 missiles if they attack first. Laird fears that 425 SS-9s might destroy all but 50 or so of our Minutemen in one strike. But in any case it is not up to Laird, Foster or Lapp, it is only up to the Soviets to decide at what stage they can destroy enough of our stuff on the ground if we leave it all defenseless.

They are building to destroy our strikeback power. Whether it takes 100 or 1,000 SS-9s, so long as they don't have to risk guessing how many we can knock down, the initiative is theirs. At some point, without any worry about our defenses so long as we lack ABMs, they can decide they have enough to cut our retaliatory launchings back to some figure like 100 or 70 or you name it.

Whatever they decide, it would be a "safe" figure for them in view of the second thing the Soviets have been pushing ahead since 1966—their own ABM system. It's now seven years since the Soviets test-fired their first ABM against a missile in flight and we've never launched one and have none in operation. In view of McNamara's estimate that we could whittle away as much as 90% of the damage of a full-scale attack on us with our own ABMs, it would be tempting fate to suppose that the Soviet ABM system could not whittle 100 or so American missiles down to only a few while still in flight.

This offers us an uncomfortable equation—the possibility that by the mid-1970s the Soviet Union could launch 2,000 or more missiles against us with the expectation that they'd all get through, while no more than a handful of ours might be expected to weather destruction on the ground here or interception by the Soviets in flight.

Meanwhile, the Soviets are proceeding with steps, some of which are ominous, to save themselves as much as possible from the effects of any American missiles that might get through. They are training their people in civil defense, almost from the cradle to the grave. It begins in the lower grades and never stops. They are developing energetic and elaborate steps, in fine detail, to save their population from the effects of an attack. The subways in many of their larger cities have been designed to serve as deep shelters, too.

While all of this further reduces the potential effectiveness of any American retaliation to a Soviet attack on us, Princeton's Prof. Eugene Wigner finds another Soviet civil defense program to be "frightening." They have "elaborate plans for the evacuation of their cities . . . in the minutest detail," he reports. Professor Wigner, holder of four of the highest honors that can go to an American scientist, ranks near the top of American experts on Soviet civil defense. Among such experts, plans to evacuate cities are menacing. It's generally conceded that there's no time to evacuate a city once enemy missiles are on the way. Only a nation that plans to strike the first blow—hence knows the day, hour and minute—can have the time to profit from detailed plans to empty their cities. But "evacuation is . . . now at the center of the Soviet program," Professor Wigner reports.

What we have said to this point goes to the guts of why first Johnson, then Nixon, wanted us to get started pronto on an ABM system.

The rapid growth of Soviet attack power, and the Russian steps to neutralize the peacemaking power of our own missiles so alarmed both of them that they laid their prestige and their influence with Congress on the line to front for ABMs—but fast.

Both were shrewd enough politically to know that they would be subjected to the very attacks in Congress, in the press and on TV that have in fact resulted. But they pushed ahead anyway.

If the reader wonders why they knew that they'd meet intense resistance to a proposal better to safeguard the nation, the opposition to ABMs has not even pretended to be subtle about it.

At the bottom level of resistance we have seen "protest demonstrators" toting placards saying "Down With ABM," while ABM has become a prime dirty word to American Communists, be they of the Chinese, Cuban, or Soviet school. This is the enemy talking, of course, and needs no further elaboration.

A more important level of resistance is found right in Congress among those who openly say that they'd like to appropriate more of the Defense budget for more popular programs here at home. They particularly like to equate Defense spending with such things as the anti-poverty program, as if national defense and welfare-like programs were interchangeable. Irrelevant as it is, this is a potent political argument. If all other things were equal, a politican would rather show his constituents how he appropriated money to satisfy their immediate desires, rather than for hardware for their future safety that will work best if it is never used.

President Johnson had enough respect for the raw political appeal of this kind of opposition to emphasize that he only wanted a "thin" ABM system (i.e.: to play down the cost). Since he proposed to protect cities, a "thin" system couldn't easily be explained as a worthwhile one against the Soviet power to attack cities. So he said he wanted it to protect us from "Chinese" missiles. They might be ready in small numbers about the time we could have ABM's operational if we'd gone ahead with them last year.

Nobody was deceived by this. Americans and Soviets alike understood that he was after the beginnings of something to knock down Soviet missiles, and nobody supposed that, once his Sentinels had been installed, those in control would inquire into the nationality of an approaching missile before knocking it down.

Since Johnson's language made his proposal politically palatable, and the majority of Congress was of his party, his Sentinel program was approved.

It ran into trouble when hardly any city wanted it, each one being morally certain that having ABMs around it would make it Target #1 in a Soviet attack. Only two Sentinel sites were started, one near Pittsburgh and one near Boston. (Both have been, in effect, ploughed under.) Meanwhile, there was no answer to the objection that to defend each city adequately against Soviet attack would require a perfectly enormous setup of ABMs, and the *real* concern was over the great Soviet menace and not the limited Chinese one.

When President Nixon took office, he proposed the more sensible and forthright Safeguard system. Let's defend our land-based missiles and our command centers with ABMs, not our cities, he proposed. This is feasible, though it is still offered as a "thin system. There. There are less than 20 sites to protect. No city becomes more of a prime target, thereby. If we protect our attack missiles the Soviets will have lost their assurance that SS-9s or warheads of any power can get through in time to stop us from retaliating against an attack. Hence we'd have moved back toward the peacemaking balance of power that has been our true policy all along.

Another kind of opposition to our having defensive missiles helps explain the mystery of the intense opposition to Nixon's plan, when it overcomes the major objections to Johnson's. This is the widespread, well-publicized, emotional and irrational opposition which has chosen to make the defeat of the ABM a convenient club for various political, personal and ideological grievances. Even some Senators have minced no words in opposing the ABM as a way of "punishing" the military, or the so-called "military-industrial complex."

This is highly attractive reasoning to some extremely vocal minorities. Draft-card burners, Vietnam war protestors, the various "militants" for this and that who are mad at The Establishment readily follow such leadership. A club to beat The Establishment with is what they want. We have already seen so outstanding a nuclear expert as Lapp making the *Pueblo* incident a reason to oppose the ABM, and a recent two-page ad by a major book publisher in the New York Times summoned opposition to ABMs in huge black letters on the basis that we never had to use the bomb shelters that some people built some years back.

What these approaches lack in good reasoning they more than make up for in emotional wallop and in their appeal to headline writers. They have gotten far more publicity than the detailed, painstaking exposition of the hard military facts by defense experts.

Whenever public debate is based on irrelevant hostility, it can frustrate all attempts at intelligent discussion. Consider this dilemma of Professor Wigner in a debate with Cornell's Prof. Hans Bethe about ABMs. Professor Wigner is the Princeton scientist whom we have already quoted on Soviet civil defense and city evacuation plans. Bethe is almost as distinguished. Both men are Nobel Prize winners in the sciences.

A year and more ago, Bethe was bringing his scientific reputation to bear against President Johnson's Sentinel ABM system. This year he was opposing Nixon's Safeguard system, While Professor Wigner was arguing for the Nixon proposal as an urgent national necessity.

The two men met in a panel debate on ABMs before The American Physical Society last April 29. Professor Wigner pointed out that when the Johnson system was being considered by Congress, Professor Bethe had testified against it, and had volunteered, instead, the very system Nixon switched to. Said Professor Wigner: "At the end of his Congressional testimony, Professor Bethe said, 'A completely different concept of ABM [from Johnson's city defenses] is to deploy it around Minutemen silos and at command and control centers. This application has gone in and out of Defense Department planning. I am in favor of such a scheme.'"

Professor Wigner wanted to know why, when Nixon adopted the plan that Professor Bethe had recommended, Professor Bethe then came out against it.

The ABM actually offers us one of several weapons choices in a rapidly changing shift in the international balance of nuclear power toward Soviet—and soon Chinese—might. It has almost nothing to do with most of the best publicized public debate about it. When the Soviet power increase had become obvious by 1967, McNamara wanted us to increase our retaliatory power to offset it. His argument, as interpreted by D. G. Brennan in a recent issue of Foreign Affairs, was highly complex in its details, since it involved comparative costs and their effect on both sides. But it added up to something like this:

If we install defenses, the Soviets will increase their attack power even more to offset them. Then both sides will be put to pushing their attack power even farther than if we put balance destructive power against destructive power, without any defenses. As Brennan put it, McNamara wanted us to do whatever was necessary to maintain an ability after suffering the first blow to destroy 50 million Russians, because *that* would forever stay their hand from hitting us first.

Perhaps the Johnson Administration realized finally that we could never be sure of our striking power, in the face of Soviet developments, and we'd have to have defenses of our own if they were to continue to respect our posture. At any rate, it switched from seeking more destructive power to an urgent request for ABMs. Of course there were other factors, perhaps the chief of which was the overwhelming evidence that the Soviets were escalating both the offensive and defensive aspects of nuclear power as fast as they could, without our doing anything new to force them into an arms race.

This touches on an interesting part of this year's American debate over ABMs. One of the sternest warnings of the opponents of our ABMs is that they would "escalate the arms race"—it would provoke the Soviets if we should set up weapons to knock theirs down.

This drove Washington's Sen. Henry Jackson to distraction because, on the record, they have been racing as hard as they can without any new provocation from us. In a speech this March 20, he listed what he called "five myths" about our "aggressive provocation" and the "peaceful intentions" of the Soviets. His comments on "Myth Number Three" are worth quoting in full:

Myth Number Three is the idea that it is the United States that is responsible for heating up the arms buildup.

The evidence decisively refutes this notion.

The Soviets acted first to test-fire an ABM against an incoming nuclear-armed missile (in 1962) and they are the only nation to have done this.

The Soviets acted first to develop and test a 60-megaton bomb—and they are the only nation to possess anything like that size bomb.

The Soviets acted first to develop and deploy a fractional orbital bombardment system (FOBS), a first-strike oriented weapon—and they are the only nation to have developed or deployed such a system.

The Soviets acted first to deploy an ABM setup and they have been testing, improving and updating the system ever since. Today, they have over 60 anti-ballistic missiles deployed on launch pads. We, on the other hand, have not yet deployed an ABM setup of any shape or form.

The current campaigners against the ABM say that when the United States acts to deploy an ABM *we* are "escalating the arms race." I have never heard one of those people say that because the Soviets were first to deploy an ABM, they were the ones that escalated the arms race.

Fortunately, the American people, if they get the facts, are able to recognize this obvious double standard—crudely biased against their own country.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Soviet Premier Kosygin has explicitly rejected the proposition that deployment of a defensive missile system heats up the arms race or is "destabilizing."

At a London press conference on February 9, 1967, Premier Kosygin was asked:

"Do you not share the opinion that the development of the Soviet anti-missile system is a new step in the arms race?"

Premier Kosygin replied: "Which weapons should be regarded as a tension-factor—offensive or defensive weapons? I think that a defense system which prevents attack is not a cause of the arms race but represents a factor preventing the death of people."

No weapons system, of course, is or will be perfect. Our offensive weapons aren't perfect, and our defensive arrangements won't be either. But that doesn't mean we refuse to deploy them when we believe they can perform a useful and important task well enough to make a substantial contribution to the overall deterrent.

I commend President Nixon for his determination to proceed with the phased deployment of a thin ABM system, and I believe all Americans should now support their President in his statesmenlike decision. It would make no sense to leave this country altogether "naked" to enemy missile attack. And it is important to steady and fortify our President's hand in this very unsteady world. I am a Democrat. But I am proud that over the years I have supported my President—whether he was a Democrat or a Republican—in the critical decisions to safeguard the national defense and to protect the future of individual liberty.

It is interesting to note that even Soviet Premier Kosygin sees what many of us ought to see, too. He also told one reporter in London, "Maybe an antimissile system is more expensive than an offensive system, but it is designed not to kill people but to preserve human lives." Professor Wigner, in his debate with Bethe, said, "I quite agree with Kosygin and do not consider the defense of the people to be objectionable, or, as it is often put when our own defense measures are considered, provocative."

If both sides could some day develop even a fairly "impenetrable shield," there is at least a faint promise of an eventual end to the matching of destructive power with more destructive power, "overkill" with "overkill."

The Soviets ignored the approaches of President Johnson to discuss nuclear arms control so long as they erected defenses and we did not. Congress had hardly approved the now-dead Sentinel plan when the Russians offered to sit down and discuss the whole subject. Without pretending to read their minds, or trust them farther than you can spit, it is entirely possible that they recognized that if the other side has ABMs you can never risk an attack on him. Whether his ABMs would work well or not, you'd never know without taking too great a risk. In this view, and it makes sense, the Soviets may have long seen that the basic condition for seriously discussing nuclear arms reduction is that both sides have defenses. But if *they* had defenses and *we* didn't it would be preposterous for them to bargain with us, because they'd have the upper hand beyond all bargaining. At least they made a prompt offer to talk the moment the Senate OK'd Johnson's ABM plan.

ROTC—WELLSPRING OF LEADERSHIP

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time in our Nation's history when the ROTC program is being seriously attacked on our college campuses as anti-intellectual, it is refreshing to share with my colleagues a recent article by Gen. William C. Westmoreland, presenting a rational evaluation of the program.

General Westmoreland believes that

ROTC provides the balance sought between the professional and the citizen soldier. Of the latter, it is only in the environment of the American university system that the young cadet integrates his military training with that of economics, politics, sociology, et cetera. Thus, the removal of the system would not promote, as some dissidents proclaim, but only sever existing dialog between the military-civilian communities.

The article was called to my attention by the executive director of the Association of Military Colleges and Schools of the United States as it appeared in the August 1969 issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine. I might also add that four schools in my State are members of this association. They are Georgia Military College, Gordon Military College, North Georgia College, and Riverside Military Academy. Both the VFW and AMCS are stalwarts in the support of the ROTC programs. I commend General Westmoreland's comments to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

ROTC—WELLSPRING OF LEADERSHIP—CITIZEN-SOLDIER CONCEPT STRENGTHENS AMERICA

(By Gen. William C. Westmoreland)

One of our Nation's outstanding soldiers recently assumed the duties of Deputy Commander of the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam. He is Gen. William B. Rosson, former Commander, First Field Force, Vietnam, and holder of the Distinguished Service Cross—our nation's second highest award for valor. Gen. Rosson is a graduate of the University of Oregon.

In Paris, another distinguished soldier was recently assigned by President Nixon to be military advisor at the Paris peace talks. He is Lt. Gen. Fred C. Weyand, former Commander of Second Field Force, Vietnam, and also a holder of the DSC.

This soldier-diplomat is a graduate of the University of California.

In the Pentagon, two other eminent soldiers occupy two of the highest positions on the Army staff. One is the Assistant Vice Chief of Staff, Army Lt. Gen. William DePuy, twice winner of the DSC, former Commander of the 1st Infantry Division, and a graduate of the University of South Dakota. The other is the Chief, Office of Reserve Components. He is Lt. Gen. William R. Peers, three times recipient of the Distinguished Service Medal, former Commander of First Field Force, Vietnam, and a graduate of UCLA.

These officers—as well as 148 other general officers currently on active duty and serving in various positions of national trust and great responsibility—are all ROTC graduates. They are products of a college pre-commissioning system which throughout the years has produced officers of the caliber of Nobel Peace Prize winner Gen. George C. Marshall, and former Army Chief of Staff, Gen. George Decker. They have left their mark on the pages of history. Such men have contributed much to the progress of this nation—not only in the area of national defense, but in the diplomatic arena of international affairs.

Where did these soldier-statesmen get their start? First, they came from average American homes throughout our nation and matriculated through normal primary and secondary school systems in their home areas.

The next step was an adventure in independence and decisionmaking as college students. In college they met new challenges as they were introduced to the environment of group living and associations with other young people from varying backgrounds. This was the start of a liberal education that would prepare them for a life of leadership.

During their college years each of them was favorably influenced by the Professor of Military Science and members of his staff, or they probably would not have completed ROTC. Their wise decision to become ROTC cadets set them on their way to heights of personal achievement in the service of their nation. Earlier they had recognized the value and satisfaction to be gained from careers in public service. They saw the advantage of competing for a commission as an Army officer, while concurrently completing the requirements for a baccalaureate degree.

This year more than 16,400 young men like them will raise their hands and recite the oath of allegiance to the United States—an oath which will start them on one of the most developmental phases of their lives. Perhaps among that number is another George C. Marshall. We can be certain there will be many who will make their mark in history. We know the vast majority will serve with great distinction. Most of them will return to civilian life better equipped to accept the reins of civilian leadership in their own communities.

ROTC program throughout the years. Look-

There is good reason for the success of the ing at the past, we can see that the concept of ROTC is fundamental to our national philosophy. ROTC traces its lineage to the establishment of military training at colleges and universities such as Norwich University in 1819 and Virginia Military Institute in 1839. Later, the Land Grant Act of 1862 provided for military training at state universities in return for land concessions from the federal government.

ROTC legislation enacted in 1916 was conceived as an outgrowth of the philosophy of Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood when he was Army Chief of Staff. General Wood's policy regarding military force structure was one of "reasonable preparedness" to include having the largest possible trained reserve force. Accordingly, a system was created to produce in times of peace a large number of educated reserve officers—officers who could lead troops in times of emergency.

This basic concept of the citizen—soldier has characterized the U.S. Army since the Minutemen of Lexington and Concord took their hunting muskets from over their fireplaces to fight for freedom. The very foundation of our national strength—our Constitution—codified this principle. The Constitution states that "The Congress shall have the power . . . to raise and support armies . . . to provide and maintain a navy . . . to provide for calling forth the militia . . . to execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions . . ."

With the lessons of European history well in mind, our founding fathers wanted to preclude the establishment of a large permanent military force during times of peace. They wrote the Constitution to embody three principles which have characterized America's armed forces to this day.

First, the concept of "raising armies" envisioned citizen forces which could be mobilized in time of emergency to respond to threats to national security.

Second, the principle of maintaining forces in readiness called for naval forces in-being that were essential to the protection of the young republic.

Third, the idea of a standing militia conceived of civilian soldiers who were prepared to respond to internal as well as external emergencies.

Superimposed on the conceptual system of military preparedness where sufficient checks and balances within the legislative and executive branches of government to assure civilian control of the citizens' army. The provisions of the Constitution are as valid today as they were in the beginning and they provide our nation with sufficient flexibility to meet any commitments in national security matters.

The machinery established by the Constitution places control of the military in the hands of civilian leadership which, in turn, is responsive to the electorate. The tradition of civilian control of the exercise of military force is a cornerstone of our concept of defense. It is ingrained in the American way of life, and even those who may be called professional soldiers welcome and cherish this tradition; they would have it no other way.

To maintain a healthy military establishment, the Army seeks to preserve a balance between the citizen soldier and the professional soldier. The objective is to have a continuous movement of citizens in and out of its ranks in order that it may truly represent and identify with the people it serves.

To do this, the Army must draw first upon the complete spectrum of the American population. It must represent every geographical, economic, ethnic and cultural facet of our society. The leadership of the Army must also represent the cross section of America—drawing upon the diverse disciplines of the American university systems to supply educated and humanizing leadership required to cope with today's challenges.

The Army turns quite naturally for its educated, potential leaders to the wellspring of the nation's knowledge, the American university system. Operating in an oncampus environment, the ROTC program produces officers posessing a variety of civilian intellectual backgrounds—men with technological, political, economic and sociological skills. These skills are typical of the men needed by the armed forces to carry out the complex missions assigned to them.

The days when wars were fought by military strategy and tactics alone have long since passed. Rather, both the maintenance of peace and security and the waging of war require the skillful blending of all the aspects of national power—political, socio-economic, psychological and military. Leaders today must have an awareness and appreciation of all of these factors, if they are to accomplish the tasks given them.

There is only one source for men with this potential. This is the college campus of America. Here can be found the products of a liberal education—men who have had their vision expanded in the humanizing environment of free academic inquiry to assimilate competently and efficiently a myriad of interrelated matters and place them into perspective.

The Army today is complex, not just because of the demands of advanced technology but because the Army is consistently involved in highly complex situations. Officers charged with leadership of troops and management of national resources are required to cope simultaneously with life and death situations. The nature of these challenges warrants the efforts of our best educated youth. Furthermore, the parents of young Americans expect their sons to be led by the best, an expectation which must be met.

The ROTC program has undergone considerable change since its inception because progressive change is a necessary ingredient of any successful program. The first ingredient is a well educated group of professional people to direct the program. Young officers are assigned to ROTC duty each year. All have baccalaureate degrees. Many have or are pursuing advanced degrees.

Not too long departed from the college campus themselves, these young officers reflect the emphasis placed on education by the Army—an Army which boasts 90% plus officers with baccalaureate degrees, and over 20% with master's or higher degrees. The youth, ability and integrity of these officers enable them to identify with the students they help teach. They are respected by the cadets who see in them the personification of American youth with all its confidence and vigor.

They are forthright, enthusiastic, personable and decisive. They have their eyes on the future and can be counted on to give straight, honest answers. They think for themselves as progressive American young men. They are available to the ROTC cadets for valuable advice and counsel. These officers also contribute to the academic community. Together with their families, they enter into civic, religious and academic activities. These articulate, dependable and compassionate professionals are a most magnificent group. They are dedicated to the development of the young men who learn in their classrooms—to their development as good American citizens.

Still another ingredient of the vigorous ROTC on-campus program is a flexible approach to academic matters. ROTC curriculum need not be stereotyped. To keep pace with the changing academic scene, revisions have been made. The Army's current curriculum concepts will bring an additional measure of flexibility to the program. This curriculum recognizes that the mission of the ROTC is to obtain college graduates who have the potential to become quality officers.

Greater emphasis will be placed on specific academic subjects within a core curriculum. Some students in selected disciplines may be required to carry Army-taught professional subjects as an overload. It is certainly not unreasonable to expect students to do this if the reward is proportionate to the amount of work involved. In the ROTC program, it is a commission, the gold bar of the second lieutenant.

The Financial Assistance Program now in its fourth year will graduate the first group of four-year scholarship winners this year. This extremely successful program has drawn the finest high school students to our college and university campuses. These young men are selected on a "whole man" system which evaluates their organizational ability and athletic prowess, together with their scholastic aptitude. It has produced exemplary young college graduates for the officer corps.

The majority of scholarship winners will receive Regular Army commissions and will embark on rewarding and satisfying careers as professional Army officers. As they advance through the junior grades, they will receive additional schooling, both military and civilian. The majority will receive advanced academic degrees. These young men represent the finest qualities of American youth. Their entry on active duty strengthens our junior officer ranks and offers great hope for quality leadership of our Army of the future.

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps has been the saving force in our past. It is the continued hope of the future. Requirements for high-caliber leadership do not diminish with time. The advanced technology and sophistication of our modern-day Army demand that the Officer Corps be continually enriched by men who are worthy of the many challenges of the future.

ROTC has stood the test of time and it has grown to the point where it is the major source of commissioned officers for our active Army. As we march toward the 21st Century, we look to this viable program to continue to provide the leadership—both military and civilian—that our great country has always surfaced from the mainstream of its civilian society.

ANTITRUST, A NATIONAL POLICY

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most brilliant messages of the year was delivered by Mr. James J. Ling, chairman of the board of Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc. on August 12, 1969, to the American Bar Association. Mr. Ling's message was timely and of vital importance to everyone in this country.

Ling-Temco-Vought is the largest business operating in the State of Texas. It has been successful through wise planning, strong executive leadership, excellent labor participation, and an intellectual research and development program.

The importance of multi-industry companies is of keen concern to all of us in Congress. It means jobs and prosperity in most every congressional district. I believe that you will find the message of James J. Ling factual and sound in its perceptive analysis.

The message follows:

ANTITRUST, A NATIONAL POLICY

(An address by James J. Ling)

Ladies and Gentlemen, distinguished members of the American Bar Association, I am pleased and honored to be here with you.

Today I will not defend nor praise the so-called conglomerates, or, more accurately, the multi-industry companies. Regardless of its corporate structure, a company is neither good nor bad. *Management* is either good or bad.

Management must be judged over the long term, or as I am prone to say at times, "Let the track record speak for itself."

I will touch briefly on LTV's management philosophy and our unusual corporate structure. I would then move on to the subject of antitrust.

One thing about our company that this audience particularly might like to know is that our legal Department, back in 1962 or '63, the early days of LTV, had a legal staff of six people—three attorneys and three secretaries. Now we have a legal Department of 32 people, including law clerks, messengers, and everyone. But 14 of them are attorneys. As you know, that is the equivalent of a good-sized law firm. But we don't try to do all of our legal work in-house. We, in fact, employ several "out-house" law firms.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP—THE DIFFERENCE

Now, I would like to spend only a moment or two focusing your attention on one attribute that, in my opinion, makes LTV altogether a different type of company from most other business enterprises—the attribute of public ownership—not only of the parent-operating company, but of each major subsidiary.

Each LTV company is a separate publicly owned business. Each company is its own profit center; each is its own credit center and its own motivational center. Each company retains the same essential characteristics that it would have if LTV did not own one share of its stock.

We believe public ownership of the multi-industry company is entirely pro-competitive. The only characteristic that the LTV companies have in common is the same majority owner.

We of the parent-operating company are there to provide a little additional management expertise, if and when needed, and, most of all, some additional entrepreneurial motivation—and accountability and responsibility.

Of course, we are not infallible.

Before commencing my antitrust remarks, I would say also, however, that the experiences that we have had with the Department of Justice in the past indicated that they, too, are far from being infallible.

ANTITRUST EXPERIENCES

My viewpoint—I'm sure—will be clear to you if I review some of those experiences:

In August, 1961, when Ling-Temco and Chance Vought were merged, the Justice Department—which had been aware for seven months of the proposed merger—filed an antitrust suit which attempted to block consolidation of these two relatively small companies. The Justice Department's implication was that we would be unfair competition to the Lockheeds, McDonnells, Douglases, General Dynamics, Boeings, etc., of that day—all giants in size compared to LTV. This unbelievable lawsuit was won by LTV within four months of the initial date of filing.

In late 1965, when we proposed to acquire The Okonite Company from the Kennecott Copper Corporation (which, incidentally, had to sell Okonite because of another antitrust problem), the Justice Department filed suit to block our acquisition. Again, the unbelievable allegation was that LTV's ownership of Okonite would result in unfair competition to the Westinghouses, General Electrics, General Cables, Anacondas, and other major wire-and-cable firms in this country.

Bear in mind that Okonite had a total of 2 per cent of the wire-and-cable business in the country.

At first, the Justice Department alleged that LTV had no experience in the operation of a wire-and-cable business and would become an albatross around the neck of this fine old company—and drag it down to the bottom of the sea—thus eliminating a viable corporation from the American business scene.

That argument was so ridiculous not only to the impartial observer but to the Judge that the attorney representing the Justice Department changed his argument along the following lines:

He stated that he could visualize electronics black boxes and airframe fuselages all packed with wires and cables provided by Okonite. He charged that because of LTV's position in the aerospace industry, some reciprocity might develop with the other airframe manufacturers. This argument was unimpressive for many different reasons—but one in particular was that Okonite did not (and still does not) manufacture wire and cable for these particular purposes.

Of course, we won both the Okonite and the Chance Vought lawsuits—thanks to the checks and balances of the judicial system.

In the third—and current—case, I would like to point out that we did obtain—before we took any action—three legal opinions to the effect that LTV's acquisition of Jones & Laughlin would in no way violate existing antitrust laws. In the opinion of our internal legal counsel, one of the top firms here in Dallas, and one of the nation's leading law firms specializing in antitrust matters in Washington, D.C.—their unanimous opinion was that there would be no violation of any antitrust law.

OMINOUS OVERTURES

Now, there is no way that we could possibly relish the experience of serving as the guinea pig in this experiment with the antitrust law. In my view, this case represents an unwarranted legal vivisection that has hurt thousands of individual stockholders and has ominous overtones for the future of our capitalistic system.

LTV shareholders have lost at least $100 million in market values since the announcement of this novel lawsuit.

We anticipate that LTV itself will not realize tens of millions in potential earnings because of our preoccupation with this lawsuit and because of our direct, out-of-pocket expenses incurred in defending the suit, which are not inconsiderable.

Who should we hold responsible?

Assume that the Justice Department loses this suit, as is entirely predictable. What will be the reparation for damages done to scores of individuals and to a growing American corporation?

The Justice Department is completely immune from assuming the responsibility for its lawsuits.

There is no way to bring an experimental lawsuit against the Justice Department.

This is a very strange lawsuit, in my opinion. The Justice Department under the previous administration made no move in six months to prevent our acquisition of Jones & Laughlin. That fact plus the public remarks of the officials of the Justice Department at that time clearly indicate that such a conglomerate acquisition was deemed not to be a violation of existing antitrust legislation. This also was the attitude expressed in two government studies—the Neal Report produced under the Johnson administration as well as the Stigler Report produced by the Nixon administration—both of which, in my estimation, are quite outspoken in defense of the conglomerates. (I will comment on the specific of those two reports a little later.) Being a person with a reasonably logical and practical mind. I would like to ask a few questions: What happened within the Justice Department in its first 60 days under the new Administration to change all of this? What new studies were developed? Who were the new expert witnesses called during this time period? Did Justice send any investigative teams to LTV or J&L during this period of time? Or contact the management of either company? Or request any additional materials? What prompted this lawsuit for which Donald Turner, former Assistant Attorney General, stated publicly, as reported by *Fortune* magazine, there was no basis?

ANTI-CONGLOMERATE CRUSADE

The lawsuit is, in my view, the product of an anti-conglomerate campaign which snowballed into a crusade without anyone soberly thinking through the reasoning behind the running hysteria. So far as I know there was never a shred of evidence of any wrong-doing by any of the so-called conglomerates that could not be corrected by existing laws, so you know that the campaign arose out of considerations based more on heat than on light. And now it has become a political football, with little evidence that anyone has much regard for facts. It is my hope, incidentally, that the current investigations in Washington will correct this one-sided view and bring some sense of balance and reason to bear on a subject that is of such far-reaching importance.

Since it has become a political football, the anti-conglomerate crusade has received a lot of attention from the popular press. Because of the vague and highly generalized nature of the charges directed against multi-industry companies, it has been almost impossible to respond effectively to this type of campaign.

On this subject, it is interesting and encouraging to see the pendulum swinging as more and more editorial writers grasp the implications, or threats, to free enterprise inherent in this campaign, and more and more economists are now making careful and necessary studies of the available economic data (and are coming up with reasoned, factual views). I would recommend your reading of editorials in the two most recent editions of *Fortune*, as well as in *Barron's*. They are very intriguing.

Let me cite some of the most responsible evidence that so far has not been widely heard. I will start with testimony given one month ago to the Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust of the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate by Neil H. Jacoby, Professor of Business Economics and Policy, University of California at Los Angeles.

NINE ERRORS

In order to save time, I will paraphrase Professor Jacoby's list of nine errors in the popular arguments of the day in regard to what he termed corporate mergers and giantism and concentration and conglomeration, and their alleged threats to competition:

1. In terms of assets, the merger wave has peaked. Since the number of companies that disappeared through merger, 4,500, is only a minute fraction of the 240,000 new businesses incorporated, there is no solid evidence that a radical restructuring of the economy is underway—or that it needs to be arrested by the government.

2. Growth through acquisition accounted for only 19 percent of total asset growth of the 200 largest corporations over a 20-year period, and, thus, cannot be considered a major influence in the economy.

3. Figures that show greatly increased concentration of manufacturing assets are statistical illusions and prove nothing about the effectiveness of competition.

4. Instead of over awing, eradicating or deterring entry of small businesses into the economy, the growth of large companies apparently has encouraged the formation of new corporations to reach new highs.

On this point it was Professor Jacoby's conclusion that, and I quote: "By acquiring small firms, large corporations create a buoyant market for capital assets, and thereby create incentive to form new enterprises. A ban on business mergers would depress the rate of business formations."

Returning to my paraphrasing of Professor Jacoby's nine points:

5. Instead of administering and institutionalizing high prices for their products, large corporations increased their prices at a rate less than inflation. The biggest price increases occurred in goods and services—primarily in services—*not* produced by large manufacturing corporations.

6. The actual evidence indicates that the larger a corporation grows, the more disciplined by market competition a corporation becomes—instead of the other way around. International competition and competition from substitute materials or products provide market disciplines for the large corporations that small corporations do not experience.

7. Large conglomerate corporations do *not* lack economic or social justification, at least in theory. (And those who claim contrariwise argue on theoretical grounds.) Substantial economic and social gains *can* be realized from the organization or expansion of multi-industry corporations. Conglomeration can produce benefits to the firm and to consumers by reducing the risk/reward ratio for the enterprise through diversification. It can reduce the costs of capital, achieve economies of scale in employing specialized management talent, and transfer corporate assets from less to more effective control.

Once again I quote:

"The net effects of conglomerate mergers are probably to enhance competition."

Now let me complete the last two of Professor Jacoby's nine points:

8. There can be effective competition even in concentrated industries. (Professor Jacoby devoted considerable time to this. But I will let that observation stand alone here and now, adding only that I agree with his logic.)

9. It would be against the public interest to break up large corporations, so it should be against public policy to do so. (I'm sure most of you in the room agree, as I do, with this point, and I won't attempt to expand it.)

MORE STUDY NEEDED

In essence, the chief thrust of Professor Jacoby's testimony is that there is another side to the conglomerate controversy—and to any idea that new, more restrictive antitrust legislation or a stricter enforcement policy is needed. At the very least, there should should be much more extensive hearings and debate than are presently indicated before any efforts are taken to enact such legislation or crack down on conglomerate acquisitions and mergers.

To some extent this belief was shared by the Task Force on Productivity and Competition appointed by President Nixon. The pertinent paragraph of the Stigler Report said, and I quote:

"We seriously doubt that the Antitrust Division should embark upon an active program of challenging conglomerate enterprises on the basis of nebulous fears about size and economic power. These fears should be either confirmed or dissipated, and an important contribution would be made to this resolution by an early conference on the subject. If there is a genuine securities market problem, probably new legislation is necessary. If there is a real political threat in giant mergers, then the critical dimension should be estimated. If there is no threat, the fears entertained by critics of the conglomerate enterprises should be allayed. Vigorous action on the basis of our present knowledge is not defensible."

The Task Force on Antitrust Policy appointed by President Johnson also agrees. The Neal Report said, and I quote:

"Although the number of conglomerate mergers has increased sharply in recent years, there is only a moderate tendency toward increase in the overall concentration of manufacturing assets in American industry. Nor does the present merger movement threaten to reduce the aggregate number and proportion of smaller firms. Remedial measures based on size alone would constitute a radical innovation in our antitrust policy and no rationale is available for determining the appropriate upper limit on the size to which a single firm may grow."

This Task Force also recommended further study of many portions of public antitrust policy.

The essential agreement of the two task forces and by antitrust experts in general serves as background for the major point of my talk today.

A NATIONAL POLICY

I would like to use this podium today to call for a much different approach to establishing antitrust enforcement policy and to changing the antitrust law.

I realize that, first of all, the public interest must be served, so there must be rules and regulations by which all enterprises must conduct themselves. But I also believe that the rules and regulations should reflect precisely the national policy—and that national policy should evolve from full and careful consideration of the best interests of the nation as a whole. I would improve rather than repeal. And I am convinced that no minority should be allowed to make antitrust policy or law. I believe we are all unanimous in the conviction that political or campaign reciprocity should not influence legislation or result in damaging lawsuits.

Frankly, I do not believe that such a thing as a national antitrust policy exists—or has ever existed. Our antitrust legislation is a patchwork of special interest, special situation acts that have never drawn much lasting attention from the Congress. It seems to me that much antitrust policy is written by the courts on a case-by-case basis.

At the heart of the entire antitrust matter, it seems to me, reside the questions: Are antitrust law and enforcement policy intended to protect the consumer? To preserve the status quo? To ensure the right of the small businessman to make a profit? Please note: I did not refer to his right to compete, although that is what some people believe antitrust is all about. Others are just as sure that the purpose of antitrust is, ultimately, protection of the consumer. I'm pretty sure the consumer has never had his own say.

Consumer protection can be construed as the ultimate aim of the antitrust law, for when we say we want to preserve competition, if the hearer wants to infer that this means protection of the consumer, it is a logical inference.

The ultimate projection of our concept of protecting competition is that we do so on the consumer's behalf. Otherwise, what is our purpose in protecting competition? Should we have a national policy of protecting competition just for the sake of competition?

I believe that not only has this question never been fully debated, it has never even been posed effectively.

It is time now, in my opinion, to make antitrust a national issue, and long overdue.

Congress passed the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890 in an era when rather sensational journalism was supporting and abetting the Populist cause, and bigness in business had sinister implications for the public in a way that does not exist today.

Look for a moment at how the times have changed since 1890 when the original antitrust law went into the books. Technologically, we have substituted the electric light for the coal-oil lamp, the airplane for the riverboat, the automobile for the horse-and-buggy, radio for primitive telegraphs, television for the circus, antibiotics for cod-liver oil, heart transplants for the early grave—it would take far more time than I have been allotted here to list even a small percentage of the technological changes and improvements—and I haven't even mentioned space achievements or the recent voyage to the moon.

Very few concepts have had as little critical analysis and undergone fewer changes in the past 80 years than antitrust, even though today's world was largely unpredictable in 1890. All of the patches that have been added to the antitrust quilt during that period have been cut from the same bolt of cloth—a vague, semi-emotional feeling that bigness is bad or dangerous or the associated ill-formed concept that economic concentration is bad or dangerous. I cannot believe the Populist philosophy can really exist in the full light of today's totally different atmosphere and environment.

FAR DIFFERENT ENVIRONMENT

These feelings and indefensible concepts must be examined in the light of today's requirements: international trade, foreign competition, big labor, and big—very big—government.

In view of the fact that there has never been a real major study of antitrust, I would like to advocate that such a study be made now.

I am recommending that the American Bar Association establish a broad, comprehensive study on which a rational, responsible national antitrust policy can be based. Funding of the studies would be jointly shared by the interested parties. To undertake this study a Hoover Commission type of blue-ribbon task force of distinguished attorneys, economists, scholars and businessmen should be appointed. Let Congress appoint representatives to the National Antitrust Commission, and let the administration also name members. Certainly, the courts should be represented. Let the Commission hear all of the testimony—whether or not it agrees with their predispositions toward antitrust law. Let its investigation continue until every last speaker who wants to be heard on this vital subject has had his say. Let them continue until they have developed a body of statistical evidence that really represents a unified, universal picture of antitrust policy in all of its implications.

This over-all picture should include the findings of the eight or nine Congressional and governmental investigations now being conducted in one stage or another and involving antitrust policy in one way or another. I anticipate that these investigations will be constructive and will develop favorable as well as unfavorable data and conclusions—which should be incorporated into the National Antitrust Commission's findings.

RATIONAL AND RESPONSIBLE

Then let legislation be enacted in a rational, responsible environment, legislation that reflects the national antitrust philosophy.

By taking the position that I have outlined to you today and by asking certain questions that pertain to this lawsuit, I might very well incur the wrath of certain political appointees as well as of certain civil servants employed in the various governmental agencies. In a speech given almost one year ago in Chicago, when a similar question was raised, I stated that I strongly believed that I must take such a position, and—if we truly have become a police state and live in fear of agency reprisal and harassment for making our views known—then I feel even more obligated to make my position publicly known. I have no other acceptable alternative.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to share my points of view.

THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF HITLER-STALIN PACT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since history often repeats itself, I believe it is pertinent that we note that this period marks the 30th anniversary of the infamous Stalin-Hitler pact. This historic period is subject to vivid analysis in the August edition of ELTA, the information service of the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania.

It is my hope that the lessons of history will not be lost upon the statesmen of the present generation.

The analysis follows:

THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF HITLER-STALIN PACT

"To take a more sober view is to recognize that it is impossible to keep foreign areas seized as a result of aggression and that they should be returned to those to whom they belong."—Andrei A. Gromyko, Soviet Foreign Minister, in a speech at the Supreme Soviet, July 10, 1969

August and September of this year mark the thirtieth anniversary of the signing of treaties and secret protocols between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany with the purpose of dividing Europe between themselves. Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were among the main victims of this infamous deal. The alliance between the two totalitarian regimes virtually unleashed the Second World War, and the Soviet overlordship in East-Central Europe today is one of the lasting fruits of the Stalin-Hitler embrace in 1939.

Since Europe and the world still bear the scars of the Soviet-Nazi Pact, the infamous anniversary deserves scrutiny and contemplation. The topic is of particular relevance to the younger generation and the statesmen as well as citizens of the new states. There is a lesson and a warning in the very fact that one of the partners of the criminal deal, the Soviet imperialism, is active today very much in the same manner as it was thirty years ago.

The recent invasion of Czechoslovakia, as well as the Soviet-proposed European Security Conference, have brought anew the issue of captive East-Central Europe to the forefront of international politics. The worsening of the Sino-Soviet rift, the rising clamor of the oppressed nationalities in the Soviet Empire, and the ferment in the satellite states of East-Central Europe—all these have made the Soviet hold on the captive European countries more precarious than it has been for a long time. Moscow's choice so far has been to sit on bayonets, but how long can it do so with Peking's shadow deepening in the Far East?

Thus the trend of the events points to some sort of negotiations about Eastern and Central Europe. If such negotiations are held, it is imperative that the Western Powers treat the Soviet entrenchment in the East-Central European region for what it really is—a result of the Stalin-Hitler Pact and of application of brute force. The neo-Stalinist oligarchy in Moscow hopes that it would be able to buy Western guarantees of the present status quo in Europe for some vague promises of disarmament and cooperation and goodwill. It is extremely improbable that the West would choose to become an accessory to the Hitler-Stalin Pact by granting the Kremlin its wishes. On the contrary, what is called for is a genuine effort to begin to dismantle the structure of oppression erected by the treaty between the two totalitarian aggressors.

If and when this effort is launched, the Baltic States, the early victims of the Stalin-Hitler Pact, deserve special consideration.

NAZI-SOVIET PACT—HOW IT HAPPENED

After the Munich settlement of 1938 Europe became divided into three camps: France and Great Britain with their allies; the Axis powers; and the Soviet Union. Impressed by Hitler's successful expansion, the Soviet leaders considered the time as favorable for their own westward thrust.

Western democracies refuse Soviets special rights in Baltic

The Soviets first attempted to obtain special rights of intervention in Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Turkey, Greece and Bulgaria. They pressed this point during the negotiations between the USSR and Great Britain & France in the summer of 1939. It was against this demand that the negotiations, aimed at a conclusion of an Anglo-French-Soviet mutual assistance pact, had foundered.

The Soviet territorial and political designs at that time were described as follows by two noted American historians:

"There was more than sufficient reason for believing that the Soviet Government had territorial ambitions with regard to the entire frontier region lost to it in 1917 and the succeeding years. London and Paris were well aware of Soviet claims and hopes and therefore found themselves in an awkward if not impossible position when confronted with the Soviet note of June 2, 1939. Apart from their unwillingness to aid and abet the expansion of Communist power, they felt strongly that after posing as the defenders of small states against aggression, they could hardly themselves take part in forcing upon the Baltic States arrangements which they definitely did not want and would not accept . . . they would never, so they said, accept a definition of indirect aggression that would permit the Soviets to march into the Baltic States at their pleasure." (William L. Langer and S. Everett Gleason. The Challenge to Isolation, 1937–1940, New York, Harper, 1952, pp. 117, 119).

Soviets and Nazis divide Europe

The next move was made in Moscow, on August 23, 1939. It was on that day that Molotov and Ribbentrop, the foreign ministers of the USSR and Germany, signed the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact. A secret additional Protocol was attached to the Pact, by virtue of which "the northern boundary of Lithuania shall represent the boundary of the spheres of influence of Germany and the USSR." On September 28, 1939, after the military collapse of Poland, this Secret Protocol was amended to the effect that "the territory of the Lithuanian State falls into the sphere of influence of the USSR." (The texts of these documents are reproduced in this issue of our Bulletin.)

What followed was the conclusion of the Soviet-imposed pacts of mutual assistance between Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and the Soviet Union. Upon establishment of Soviet military garrisons on the territory of the Baltic States, the Soviets submitted ultimata to Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, on June 15–17, 1940, and promptly invaded these states. Soviet-style mock elections to the so called "People's Diets," under the supervision of the Red Army, completed the imperialist conquest. All these events were but a gradual implementation of the Secret Protocol.

Soviets retain spoils of treaty

After the end of hostilities of the World War II, the victorious Western Powers declared as null and void all the territorial changes made after 1937. Thus Germany was deprived of all the benefits of the Stalin-Hitler secret deals. The Nazi partner and signatory of these sinister documents was hanged by the Nürnberg Tribunal. In flagrant contrast, however, the Soviet Union continues to keep almost all the territories, including the Baltic States, appropriated by virtue of Soviet-Nazi Pact.

". . . Today, from Estonia to Bulgaria, and from Bohemia to the Ukraine, the attitude of elites and peoples to the Soviet Union is simple: they hate the rulers, despise the officials and pity the Russian people. . . . The Soviet Union has no policies, no culture, no morality to offer the Central Europeans. . . . The fact remains that the only answer of the Soviet rulers to the problems of the modern world are more missiles, more armored divisions, more security policemen, and more censors.

"The barbarians still have plenty of all four. Yet the 20th century has seen the collapse of too many empires to permit much confidence in the durability of the Muscovite one. Its best hope lies not in the support of its subjects, who are less and less deceived by its lies, nor even in its military strength, but in the weakness, indifference, and hysteria of the nations of Western Europe. Yet if these have the will, they still have the means to prevent their own enslavement or destruction."—Hugh Seton-Watson in *Encounter* (July 1969).

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, HON. MEL LAIRD SPEAKS TO ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of the speech given by Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Mel Laird, to the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in Philadelphia, Pa.:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MELVIN R. LAIRD

Only a few days ago your National Commander, Richard Homan, and I met in Los Angeles. We were both there to attend the banquet honoring the three men who planted our flag on the moon.

Placing our flag at the farthest outpost so far reached by man was an appropriate recognition of a great national triumph. This symbolic act was urged by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and required by the Roudebush Amendment. Our nation's success in reaching the moon within the decade of the 1960's was achieved because we were determined to do it. American ingenuity, American persistence, American courage, American brains, American teamwork, and the American taxpayer were the ingredients that brought the success of the Apollo XI mission.

The three astronauts who went to the moon have reminded us frequently that credit for this incredible achievement should also be given to countless others whose combined efforts made the project an unqualified success.

As I followed the moon flight on television, I couldn't help thinking of the heavy criticism of the so-called military-industrial-labor complex which we have been hearing. The achievement of Apollo XI should make it clear that the military-industrial-labor team is a tremendous asset to our nation and a fundamental source of our national strength. The Defense Department has been deeply involved in all stages of the program that culminated in the moon landing with particular responsibility for construction of facilities, for the recovery of men and vehicles, and for range operations. In support of the Apollo XI mission, the Department contributed 7,000 people, 54 aircraft, and 9 ships. Of the 54 astronauts now active, 47 have served in our country's armed forces, and a sizable majority of them—34, to be exact—are still on active duty. The military-industrial-labor team helped to remove the veil of uncertainty that covered so much that we had to know before we could send men to the moon. It produced the vehicles and the instruments and other equipment. I hope that our critics will note that, without the military-industrial-labor team, there would have been no Mercury, no Gemini, no Apollo.

The space program should also remind us of the importance of the individual—a fact sometimes forgotten in vast organizations. It is not just those at the top who are important. We know the names of only a few of the tens of thousands who made a direct contribution to the successful outcome of the Apollo mission—names like Armstrong, Collins, Aldrin, and Colonel Frank Borman, who is with us here this evening to receive your special award. These pioneers deserve all the tributes they are being paid, but they would still be earthbound if they had not been supported by a vast number of other individuals doing their jobs and doing them well. And so, when we honored the three astronauts at Los Angeles and when you honor Frank Borman here tonight, a salute is given to all their teammates in their historic journeys.

It is the importance of people—the importance of the individual—that is the theme of my remarks to you this evening. I intend to use this forum to announce a new set of human goals which I will promulgate to all elements of the Defense Community.

When I speak to the Veterans of Foreign Wars on this subject, I know I have a receptive and responsive audience. As a member of VFW Post 1866, Marshfield, Wisconsin, I feel very much at home at this Convention. As a member of the House of Representatives, I served with three former National Commanders, Pat Kearney, Jimmie Van Zandt, and Richard L. Roudebush, who would never let me forget the Veterans of Foreign Wars even if I wanted to.

Since its beginnings in 1899, this organization has been as dedicated to the well-being of the individual as it has to the security of the nation. These twin objectives point to urgent tasks for the present and the future.

The record of VFW in supporting every needed step to provide for national security is a proud one. In my present office, I am well aware of what you have done, particularly in the debate over President Nixon's proposal for the Safeguard Antiballistic Missile System. Let me assure you that the President and all who have direct responsibility for keeping the nation secure are grateful for that support. As Secretary of Defense, I am also aware of the continuing need for the VFW to make its voice heard on the national security issues ahead of us so that our country will remain strong and free.

VFW has an equally proud record in its service to people. In every step that the nation has taken to provide equitable treatment to its veterans and to Service personnel, VFW has given leadership and support.

This organization cannot rest on the laurels of past accomplishment, and I know you do not intend to slow down any of your activities. There is a new generation of veterans. Already, 3 million men who served in the armed forces during the war in Vietnam have returned to civilian life. It is vitally important that those who have fought in perhaps our most difficult war not be forgotten. They will add strength and vigor to veterans' organizations—these young men who have fought for us with bravery and devotion, perhaps sometimes wondering whether their countrymen cared about the cause for which they were called on to risk their lives. No war is easy for those who are in it, but it takes a special brand of determination and more than ordinary morale for fighting men to carry on when some influential and articulate voices at home belittle their efforts and the cause for which they have seen their comrades die.

For as long as our nation sends men to Vietnam, we must let these men know that they have the nation's support, esteem and gratitude. As they return to civilian life, we must see that they receive whatever help they need to enable them to live in dignity and to match in civilian life the contribution they made to their country while in Service.

For this purpose President Nixon has appointed a Committee on the Vietnam Veteran. I am privileged to serve on this Committee which is headed by Don Johnson, the able new Administrator of the Veterans Administration. When we offer our recommendations for improvement in veterans benefits, I am confident they will deserve and receive the enthusiastic support of the VFW.

When I became Secretary of Defense in January, I found my "in-basket" full of urgent problems—Vietnam . . . Korea . . . cost overruns and delays in procurement . . . ROTC . . . shortages and obsolescence of equipment not directly related to the war in Vietnam . . . the development of new weapons and equipment . . . deterioration in our relations with some of our military allies . . . arms limitation talks . . . dissatisfaction with the selective service system. I stop at this point because I've run out of breath, not because I've run out of problems.

Of all the problems facing the Department of Defense, the most difficult may be the maintenance of a strong defense posture in the future. It is a challenge which I willingly accept. After World War II, the nation allowed its military strength to recede below the level of adequacy. This Secretary of Defense does not intend to preside over a re-run of that experience. The size and the quality of the armed forces, however, are not determined by the President or the Secretary of Defense alone. The nation's security will be assured only if an informed and concerned majority of the American people demand an adequate defense posture.

And this points to another task for the VFW and similar organizations for the future.

After Vietnam, there will be pressures—even now apparent—against the maintenance of sufficient military strength.

Even now there are irresponsible attacks on the military profession. An active campaign is being waged against the ROTC. Young men are being urged by some to resist the draft. Distorted analyses of defense costs appear in print and in speeches. These are indications of the pressures that may make it more difficult to recruit qualified personnel for the armed forces and to secure the funds needed for national security.

We in the Department of Defense have spent a lot of time in self-examination and self-criticism in the past few months in an effort to detect and remedy any shortcoming within the Department that may hinder the recruitment and retention of able people.

Let me tell you about some of the important conclusions we have come to. Our studies show that improvement is needed particularly in the handling of junior officers and enlisted personnel. Most of the young men we receive are well educated and highly motivated, full of ambition, full of energy. We must see that the treatment they receive does not frustrate their ambitions or waste their energies. We must show them that loyalty and respect among military ranks are a mutual, not a one-sided, relationship—extending downward as well as upward. We must cultivate and train these young men for leadership. We must provide them with adequate compensation and personalized career development. Above all, we must make them feel that they are important people doing important jobs.

The weaknesses which we found in the Department of Defense are neither new nor uncommon. They are characteristic of mammoth organizations—in business, in labor unions, even in our schools. One of the justified complaints of students in large universities is that they get lost in the crowd, forgotten and ignored.

In big organizations it is easy for the individual to become a cog in an impersonal machine. It is easy to become so bemused by the organization chart or the computer or the weapons system or the cost effectiveness calculus that one forgets about the human beings by whom and for whom these things are produced and used. It is easy to slip into an inflexible bureaucratic routine without ever pausing to see the deadening impact of this routine on initiative; innovation, and leadership. It is easy to centralize the power to make decisions and the power to spur action at the top of a large organization and, in the process, to stifle the bright ideas and the restless energy of the people down the line.

The most important conclusion which we have reached is that we must give new emphasis to the importance of the individual. People are our most important asset. We know that, and we must give practical application to this truth throughout the Department of Defense.

The first step is to articulate clear and specific objectives. As I indicated in my opening comments, I am taking advantage of this forum to announce today a set of human goals which it will be the policy of the Department of Defense to pursue.

Our nation was founded on the principle that the individual had infinite dignity and worth. The Department of Defense, which exists to keep the nation secure and at peace, must always be guided by this principle. In all that we do, we must show respect for the serviceman and civilian employee as a person, recognizing his individual needs, aspirations, and capabilities.

The defense of the nation requires a well-trained force, military and civilian, regular and reserve. To provide such a force we must increase the attractiveness of a career in Defense so that the serviceman and the civilian employee will feel the highest pride in himself and his work, in the uniform and the military profession.

The attainment of these goals requires that we strive—

To attract to the defense service people with ability, dedication, and capacity for growth;

To provide opportunity for every one, military and civilian, to rise to as high a level of responsibility as his talent and diligence will take him;

To make military and civilian service in the Department of Defense a model of equal opportunity for all regardless of race or creed or national origin, and to hold those who do business with the Department to full compliance with the policy of equal employment opportunity;

To help each serviceman at the end of his service in his adjustment to civilian life; and

To contribute to the improvement of our society, including its disadvantaged members, by greater utilization of our human and physical resources while maintaining full effectiveness in the performance of our primary mission.

There is much that we are doing at the present time to give life to these objectives from top to bottom in the Department of Defense.

In the six months during which I have served as Secretary of Defense, I have seen to it that military leaders are neither ignored nor bypassed in any matter on which their views should be received. It is simply foolhardy not to make maximum use of the great talent, wisdom, and experience available through the Joint Chiefs of Staff and within the Services. Civilian control has not been diminished. The advice of the military, though not always followed, is always given a full and respectful hearing.

I have begun also to decentralize authority within the Department. The Services are assuming greater responsibility, because the Office of the Secretary of Defense no longer makes the decisions that can be left to the Army, Navy, or Air Force Secretaries. This will strengthen civilian control.

One of my major concerns has been the 1300 servicemen missing in action or held prisoner in Southeast Asia. I have pressed for compliance with the Geneva Convention on the part of North Vietnam and the Vietcong. This Administration has called for the names of those being held as prisoners, for the immediate release of the sick and injured, neutral inspection of prison facilities, and the free flow of mail between prisoners and their families. I salute the brave wives of these men—four of whom are here tonight—and their children and parents who live in uncertainty. We must and will continue our determined efforts on behalf of these men and their families.

I have established a new agency—the Domestic Action Council—headed by Assistant Secretary of Defense Roger Kelley to give direction and urgency to our efforts to assist in solving domestic problems. A wide range of activities is going forward in this field including the use of military facilities for educatonal and recreational programs for disadvantaged young people. This summer we have given employment to 48,000 youngsters, most of them from poor families.

Under a program called Project Transition, with the cooperation of government agencies, industry, and labor, we are endeavoring to give outgoing servicemen help they need to make a smooth transition to civilian life, including job training in civilian occupations.

I have touched only a few of the high spots in a program inspired by our recognition of the importance of people. We are doing much. We shall do more as time goes by.

To make this program fully effective, however, we have to intensify our effort and surmount many obstacles. I'd like to mention just a few of the problems we face because you in this audience can help us in coping with some of them.

In the new pay legislation which we will submit to Congress in the near future, we intend to remove the financial hardship that many military families now suffer. President Nixon in his "New Federalism" speech proposed that federal payments be made to families whose income is below certain levels. Many people do not realize that the military compensation of at least 50,000 servicemen with dependents falls below these levels although many of their families undoubtedly receive income from other sources, particularly from working wives. Nevertheless, too many military families suffer financial hardship, some of whom are even forced to go on welfare in order to survive. We are now conducting a study to find out how many they are and to understand fully the causes of this deplorable situation. As long as this situation exists, we cannot claim to have attained our objective of according people the respect due the individual human personality.

The Defense Department has made substantial progress toward eliminating discrimination in housing available to military personnel. Yet housing conditions around some military bases make a mockery of the national goal announced 20 years ago of making it possible for every American family to have a decent home in a suitable environment. This problem is one of our highest priority concerns.

The Department of Defense does a lot to provide protection to the 10,000,000 consumers for whom it has a responsibility—servicemen and their dependents. We have just completed the task of strengthening the protection given to prevent bilking and defrauding of servicemen. We have within the past two weeks moved to upgrade our credit unions which enable servicemen of all ranks to borrow on favorable terms.

But, in this field too, we have outstanding problems. For example, we are now at work seeking to reduce the discriminatory premiums some automobile insurance companies are levying on servicemen.

I want to assure that officer and NCO Clubs throughout the world are run exclusively for the best interests of their members. Recent information that I have received and that we are developing indicates that this may not always have been the case. I intend to see that any past abuses are ended and that corrective action is taken wherever indicated.

I said earlier that you of the VFW can help us in our efforts to give deserved recognition and respect to those in military service. Many of the obstacles we face—some of which I have cited—arise from practices in the civilian sector and can be removed by action of private individuals and organizations. Your influence in your home community might be invaluable in rectifying such injustices. Some obstacles can be removed only by legislative action. Here, again, you can help.

President Nixon said in his commencement address at the Air Force Academy in June, "Every man in uniform is a citizen first and a serviceman second. We must resist any attempt to isolate the defenders from the defended."

In the last analysis the Department of Defense can succeed in making a military career rewarding and respected only if it has the cooperation of the general citizenry of the country. For, those in military service will be as proud of their profession as they should be only if their fellow citizens give them respect and gratitude.

They richly deserve this respect and gratitude. I know the great majority of our citizens accord it to them—but sometimes the voice of this majority becomes only a whisper. You can help to amplify that whisper so that it comes through loud and clear. This is the least any of us can do for those on whom we must rely to keep the peace and preserve our freedom and security.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART CALENDAR OF EVENTS—SEPTEMBER 1969

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the calendar of events for the month of September 1969 of the National Gallery of Art.

The National Gallery has again scheduled an exciting number of events and exhibits for the citizens of Washington, D.C., and visitors to our Nation's Capital.

The calendar follows:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, SEPTEMBER 1969

Sunday evening concerts: Weekly concerts in the East Garden Court resume September 28, at 8 p.m. with music performed by the National Gallery Orchestra under the direction of Richard Bales.

Labor Day film: *Moulin Rouge*, the award-winning film based on the life of the nineteenth-century French artist Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec and starring José Ferrer, will be shown in the Lecture Hall at 2 p.m. on Labor Day. Running time is two hours.

Christmas catalogue: The 1969 catalogue of National Gallery Christmas cards may be requested from the Publications Office by mail or telephone (737-4215, ext. 217).

John Constable: An exhibition of 66 paintings by Britain's foremost landscape artist, selected from the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon. Studies of sky and clouds, portraits, and a group of landscapes including *Hadleigh Castle*. Fully illustrated catalogue with introduction by John Walker and notes by Ross Watson, 10" x 7½", 64 pages, 66 black-and-white illustrations, $2.50 postpaid.

Recent publication: *Blake and Tradition* by Kathleen Raine, eleventh in the Bollingen Series of The A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, distributed by Princeton University Press. Vol. I, 428 pages with 123 illustrations; vol. II, 370 pages with 71 illustrations. $22.50 postpaid.

Recorded tours: *Acoustiguide*. A 45-minute tour of 20 National Gallery masterpieces selected and described by John Walker, Director Emeritus. Portable tape units rent for 25¢ for one person, 35¢ for two. Available in English, French, Spanish, and German.

LecTour. A discussion of works of art in 28 galleries. Talks in each room, which may be taken in any order, last approximately 15 minutes. The small radio receivers rent for 25¢.

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 12 noon to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the building and to all scheduled programs.

Cafeteria hours: Weekdays, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m., luncheon service 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. Sundays, dinner service 2 p.m. to 7 p.m.

GERMAN EXPRESSIONIST WATERCOLORS

Central Gallery, September 18–October 19: Renewal of existence through freshness of vision was an aim of the German Expressionists, and perhaps why they produced so many of their pictures in the spontaneous medium of watercolor. The Gallery's fall exhibition schedule opens September 18th with a showing of 72 such masterpieces on paper from the Haubrich Collection of the Wallraf-Richartz Museum in Cologne. For the American preview, through October 19th, the Galley has added a section of important German watercolors lent by collectors in the United States.

The exhibition illustrates the three major groupings of German Expressionists, originating with *Die Brücke* (The Bridge) in 1904/05 when the students Heckel, Schmidt-Rottluff, and Kirchner formed an anti-academic studio with Nolde in Dresden. A few years later, Klee, Marc, Feininger, and others gathered around the Russian Kandinsky in Munich to evolve the increasingly abstract images of *Der Blaue Reiter* (The Blue Rider) movement. At the close of World War I and in the chaotic period that followed, a new generation emerged to reject both the emotional intensity of The Bridge and the intellectualism of The Blue Rider. Led by Otto Dix and George Grosz, *Die Neue Sachlichkeit* (The New Objectivity) rejected painterly effects to produce shocking satirical judgments on contemporary conditions.

Horst Keller, Director of the Wallraf-Richartz Museum, selected the Cologne part of the exhibition and compiled the catalogue for the International Exhibitions Foundation. Dr. Keller is one of six authorities on twentieth-century German painting who will give Sunday afternoon lectures at the National Gallery on topics related to the exhibition, from September 7th through October 12th. See weekly listings for details.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 7

Labor Day film: *Moulin Rouge*, Lecture Hall, Monday 2.

Painting of the week: Bonnard. *Standing Nude* (Lent by Mrs. Constance Mellon Byers) Gallery 76. Tues. through Sat. 12 & 2; Sun. 3:30 & 6.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11, 1 & 3; Sun. 2:30 & 5.

Sunday lecture: *German Expressionism and Modernism. Guest Speaker:* Donald E. Gordon, Chairman, Department of Fine Arts, University of Pittsburgh, Lecture Hall 4.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 14

Painting of the week: Rubens. *Marchesa Brigida Spinola Doria* (Samuel H. Kress Collection), Gallery 41A. Tues. through Sat. 12 & 2; Sun. 3:30 & 6.

Tour of the week: *German Painting*. Rotunda. Tues. through Sat. 1; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11 & 3; Sun. 5.

Sunday lecture: *German Expressionist Watercolors. Guest Speaker:* Horst Keller, Director, Wallraf-Richartz Museum, Cologne, Germany. Lecture Hall 4.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 21

Painting of the week: Murillo. *A Girl and Her Duenna* (Widener Collection), Gallery 51. Tues. through Sat. 12 & 2; Sun. 3:30 & 6.

Tour of the week: *Expressionist Tendencies in Art*. Rotunda. Tues. through Sat. 1; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11 & 3; Sun. 5.

Sunday lecture: *Expressionism and German Architecture. Guest Speaker:* Barbara Miller Lane, Professor of History, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania. Lecture Hall 4.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 28

Painting of the week: Andrea del Sarto. *Charity* (Samuel H. Kress Collection), Gallery 13. Tues. through Sat. 12 & 2; Sun. 3:30 & 6.

Tour of the week: *The Exhibition of German Expressionist Watercolors*. Central Gallery. Tues. through Sat. 1; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11 & 3; Sun. 5.

Sunday lecture: *The Watercolor Medium and the Expressionist Message. Guest Speaker:* Julia S. Phelps, Lecturer on German Art, German Department, Harvard University, Cambridge, Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, *Conductor*, East Garden Court 8.

CRISIS IN WORLD STRATEGY: THE RISE OF SOVIET RUSSIA'S NAVAL POWER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in past speeches on crises in world strategy, I have dealt with various elements in the changing world power structure picture.

Until 1967, Soviet Russia was primarily a land power. Since then Soviet naval strength has expanded greatly, especially in types of vessels in which the U.S. Navy is weak, and is rapidly attaining the military potential that will enable it to challenge the naval forces of the United States.

An informative editorial in the August 31, 1969, Sunday Star of Washington, summarizes the history of the evolution of Soviet sea power.

Because of its relevance to current problems of world politics, I make it part of my remarks, as follows:

THE RISE OF SOVIET RUSSIA'S NAVAL POWER

While the United States Navy is retiring 76 ships and defense budgetparers are demanding further cuts in naval spending, the Soviet Union is well on its way to becoming the world's leading maritime power.

Russian squadrons are cruising the seven seas, breaking the Red ensign over troubled waters from the Caribbean to the Persian Gulf in a profound reversal of Moscow's relatively recent landlubber policies.

Although the Russians never have been a sailor people, the lure of the sea is nothing new for Muscovy. Peter the Great, who ruled from 1682 to 1725, fathered the Russian Navy. After working incognito in a Dutch shipyard to obtain personal knowledge of maritime matters, Peter through his Baltic conquests and the construction of St. Petersburg (Leningrad) gave Russia her "window on the world."

Catherine the Great, whose sexual voraciousness matched her lust for power, consolidated Peter's work and—through judicious use of such 18th Century cutlasses-for-hire as John Paul Jones—contested mastery of the Caspian with the Ottoman Turks and won control of the Black Sea.

In an interesting parallel to the present situation, Russian fleets plied the Mediterranean for 40 years before their recall was forced in 1807 by the growing might of Napoleonic France.

Diversion of Russian energies to the conquest of the Eurasian land-mass, the superior technology of the Western maritime nations, and poor leadership combined in the 19th Century to force the czarist navy into a defensive posture. The ultimate humiliation came with the Japanese annihiliation in 1904–05 of Russian fleets at Port Arthur and Tsushima, contributing to the atmosphere of despair which culminated in the October Revolution a dozen years later.

The navy fared little better under the Kremlin's Communist rulers. Suspect as a nest of aristocratic sympathies, the navy was savagely purged and starved of appropriations.

Stalin, an insular Georgian who thought in continental rather than global terms until his last years, created only a "fortress fleet" for coastal defense, subordinating the navy to army command during World War II.

In the last decade of Stalin's life, Russian strategy reverted to Peterist concepts. The Soviet Union extended its "window on the world" by annexing the Baltic states, and began laying the keels of a balanced fleet to match its new postwar power.

Under Khrushchev and the present Brezhnev-Kosygin duomvirate, the Kremlin pushed a program of naval construction that was at once recognition of the declining maritime strength of Britain and France and admission of the political and military need to challenge America on the high seas.

Although the need for a global fleet probably had been conceded by them, the single event underlining this imperative unquestionably was the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, when lack of conventional Soviet naval power forced a humiliating defeat on the Russians which contributed to Khrushchev's downfall.

Since that day, Russian military spending, including naval allocations, has increased annually. This year the Russians are spending the equivalent of about $60 billion on defense, as compared to about $80 billion for the U.S. But when the costs of the Vietnam war are deducted—about $29 billion annually—it becomes clear that the Russians are spending more than we are on weaponry, although their gross national product is only half that of the U.S.

The Russian fleet now totals 1,575 vessels, as opposed to 894 American ships, excluding the 76 to be mothballed within the next three months. More importantly, Moscow's growing armada is more modern than ours: 58 percent of our navy's combat ships are 20 years or more old; in contrast, only 1 percent of Russia's navy is that old. Nor is the Russian edge limited only to numbers and newness: Soviet excellence in naval missilery, electronics, fire-control and hull-design is acknowledged by Western experts.

Although the U.S. Navy enjoys overwhelming superiority in aircraft carriers, the Russians outnumber us in submarines by 375 to 143. According to recent testimony by Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, the Navy's nuclear boss, the Russians are building one Polaris-type submarine per month and will overtake us in this aspect of the nuclear field by the end of next year.

While land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles may be the most vital element in any nation's arsenal, the Russians have recognized—if we have not—that naval superiority can be crucially important in the immense range of alternatives short of total nuclear war.

By their nature, missiles are both remote and invisible, having little day-to-day political impact around the world. But the presence in a neutralist port of a modern Russian fleet gives visual testimony to the politicoeconomic might of the Soviet Union, lends dignity to local Communist parties, encourages trade, facilitates intelligence gathering and overawes wavering governments.

Logic and the movements of the Red Fleet serve to identify the initial goal of Soviet naval strategists: Predominance in the Mediterranean where 63 warships—half their long-range fleet—are cruising.

Through its pro-Arab, anti-Israel policies, the Kremlin has gained political leverage and concomitant military footholds along the southern shore of that sea, from Latakia in Syria to Mers-el-Kebir in Algeria. Soviet naval activity in the Mediterranean during the first half of 1967 was 400 percent greater than the comparable figure for all 1963; since the earlier year, Russian submarine activity in the Mediterranean has increased 2,000 percent.

With the end of British rule in Aden, the Russians have expanded their influence at the southern end of the Red Sea, solidified their position in Egypt and placed heavy pressure on the Turks for unrestricted use of the Dardarnelles. In Gibraltar, Spain—supported directly by the Arabs and indirectly by the Soviet Union—is trying to expel Britain from the Mediterranean's western gate.

If and when the Suez Canal is reopened, it appears more than possible that the Russians will have compliant regimes at each of the Mediterranean's corks. This would provide moral support to the Communist parties of Italy and France (the biggest in the West) and open the way to that historic Russian goal, the Indies.

In short, the peoples of the world are going to be seeing more of Soviet naval squadrons in the near future. Ivan's wake is going to be foaming blue water from New Orleans to Tokyo, from Valparaiso to Cape Town.

We know too much to doubt Russia's military capabilities. We can only guess at the Kremlin's intentions. But the prognosis—in view of increased Russian defense spending, the crushing of domestic dissent and the demonstrated willingness to take military risks in Europe and Asia—cannot be sanguine.

Under the circumstances, those who seek to slash our defense budget—and particularly naval allocations—must be very sure they are trimming fat and not military muscle.

We do not quarrel with the retirement of over-age ships. But if this nation is to preserve its influence among the countries washed by the seven seas, this should be matched by a substantial building program to modernize both our navy and merchant fleet.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS EAGLETON

HON. BILL D. BURLISON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my State's junior Senator, the Honorable THOMAS EAGLETON has just recently made a whirlwind factfinding tour of my district. This outstanding young man is widely recognized in his home State because of his exemplary record in local and State government. Now, as a first-term Member of the Congress, he is rapidly gaining a similar respect. I would like, at this time, to share the thought-provoking remarks of Senator EAGLETON delivered in my district, as follows:

SPEECH AT THE POPLAR BLUFF KIWANIS CLUB, AUGUST 14, 1969, POPLAR BLUFF, MO.

(By Senator THOMAS F. EAGLETON)

The hottest issue before the Senate and the issue which most directly affects every American is the Tax Reform Bill of 1969.

The essential provisions of the present income tax system were enacted over fifty years ago. Since that time, numerous incentives and preferences have been made a part of the tax code to meet the need—whether apparent or real—of some limited segments of the economy.

Increasingly in recent years, taxpayers with substantial incomes have found ways of gaining tax advantages from these provisions and in many cases, have managed to pile one advantage on top of another.

The scope of such "legal tax evasion" precludes mere patchwork remedies. A comprehensive reform is essential.

Ours is a system which relies primarily on the individual to compute and pay his own tax. The voluntary payment system will continue to be effective only for as long as the American taxpayer feels that everyone else is in the same boat—that all must help bear this burden.

Inevitably, it will fail if the ordinary taxpayer finds that he is paying a disproportionate share, or if he sees well-placed individuals and corporations with large incomes evading all taxes.

In 1967 there were 155 individuals with adjusted gross incomes of $200,000 or more who paid no income tax. Twenty-one of these were millionaires with a combined income of more than $60 million. There were 626 millionaires who did pay income tax at an average rate of 56 percent of their taxable income—the same rate which normally applies to a single person with a taxable income of $32,000 and who is not in a position to utilize the same advantages as a millionaire.

We are all familiar with the many other loopholes and devices so favored by wealthy individuals and corporations with special preferences.

There is the real-estate operator who earns millions and pays taxes at the same rate as the father who earns $10,000 per year. There are the hobby farmers who can make a tax profit by farming at a loss, while they compete with real farmers who not only have to struggle for a slim profit but pay their full share of the taxes as well. And there are the oil and mining companies which have enjoyed depletion and extraction allowances for so long that the rates at which these allowances are fixed become, in their view, immutable and beyond question.

Tax incentives or tax breaks have a legitimate place in a pluralistic society when they serve the public interest. But when incentives become loopholes . . . when tax breaks become shelters . . . and when the public interest gives way to private interests, it is time for a judicious but thorough house cleaning.

The bill passed by the House and now pending before the Senate represents a determined effort to make our tax structure more equitable at all levels. Thus, it provides not only tax reform but also tax relief for the middle income classes who now bear such a heavy share of the tax burden.

The House bill provides considerable relief for these middle-income taxpayers. It is esimated that 58 per cent of individual taxpayers in 1969 will use the standard deduction which is now limited to a maximum of $1000. Over the next three years those taxpayers will be able to take advantage of an increased standard deduction on a graduated basis until it reaches $2000—or double the present amount—in 1972.

Forty-two per cent of individuals paying taxes in 1969 will itemize their deductions. For these individuals, the bill provides an average tax reduction of 5 per cent in two installments occurring in 1971 and 1972.

Single persons over 35 who have been denied the advantages given to married persons will now begin to get a break similar to that of married persons filing a joint return.

The Senate Finance Committee has pledged—as a condition of the temporary continuation of the surtax—to complete its deliberations on this bill by October 31 and report it to the Senate floor for debate and vote. The Senate will have an ample opportunity to give careful consideration to the many complex details contained in this 368-page bill.

I, for one, will want to carefully review those provisions dealing with the income of private foundations and with the interest on municipal bonds, both of which have been tax-free in the past. The freedom of private foundations to gamble on new ideas in science and education, or the ability of municipalities to sell tax-free bonds at reduced rates, means that we are less dependent on Washington to finance social progress and innovation.

The momentum for change in our tax laws is running strong. The Democratic leadership in Congress has set the end of the year as its target for completion of action on this legislation. I am confident that we can achieve this target if the Administration is sufficiently aware and sufficiently concerned about the legitimate grievances underlying the current "taxpayers' revolt" . . . and if the President is willing to use his prestige and resources in support of this movement.

SPEECH AT THE CIVIC CLUB DINNER, KENNETT, MO., AUGUST 15, 1969

(By Senator THOMAS F. EAGLETON)

For more than a month, the United States Senate has been engaged in an historic debate over a bill to authorize the appropriation of approximately $20 billion for the procurement of military equipment.

Public attention has been largely focused on just one aspect of the bill—the narrowly defeated amendment to eliminate funds for the Safeguard ABM system.

But there is an issue which many have overlooked amidst all the sound and fury and publicity stemming from the ABM debate: for the first time in decades Congress has taken a serious and detailed review of the Pentagon's request for funds. This development may in the long run be of even greater significance than the ABM authorization.

Year after year the generals and admirals have marched up to Capitol Hill to relate new and often exggerated threats and to recommend new and ever more costly weapons systems to meet them—claiming that each is absolutely necessary for national security. And Congress, virtually without exception, has voted as much as the Pentagon has asked, or more.

The reluctance of Congress to challenge Pentagon fund requests is understandable. First, the funds are almost always sought in the name of national security, and who wants to be against national security?

Second, the whole subject of weapons systems, military equipment and defense authorizations is incredibly complicated, often having its roots in abstruse technological concepts.

For example, the Armed Services Subcommittee which deals with military research and development projects was called upon this year to deal with requests for the authorization of thousands of research and development projects with costs totaling $8.2 billion. In an attempt to reduce this figure to manageable proportions, the Subcommittee extracted from the list all the projects costing $2 million or more—and found that there were more than 2,000 of these.

The three Senators on this Subcommittee have exactly one staff member to aid them in their work. Obviously, no full-fledged review is going to result from this system.

For this reason I think it is important to note that the Senate, after it rejected the anti-ABM amendment, approved several amendments to provide detailed information in the future about military projects and their costs. The Government Accounting Office, which is an arm of the Congress, will be obliged to make regular reports to Congress concerning the overall cost of military research and procurement and will provide detailed cost studies of some specific projects.

As an example, a compromise was reached on a bipartisan amendment offered by Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon, and myself which will require a GAO study of the constantly escalating costs of the Army's Main Battle Tank project. The research and development costs of this system, conceived in 1963, have risen 528 per cent in just 6 years, while the tank's projected operation date has slipped back from 1969, its originally estimated operational date, to 1974 or 1975.

In short, Congress has begun to exercise its responsibility to put military programs under the same looking glass and to give them the same scrutiny that it has heretofore given such programs as aid to education or job training for the unemployed. If nothing else, the Senate debate of the last month has awakened Congress to the need for the kind of information that will enable it to conduct such a review and, ultimately, to make allocations of national resources on a more intelligent basis.

SPEECH AT THE YOUTH COMMUNITY BETTERMENT DINNER, AUGUST 15, 1969, DEXTER, MO.

(By Senator THOMAS F. EAGLETON)

The purpose of this dinner tonight—to build a new teen center for Dexter—is the kind of project with which I am most happy to be associated. I think this teen center is important not only for what it will be but also as a symbol of what local communities can do—themselves—to become better places to live.

The kind of forward-looking attitude represented by this project is essential to the survival of the nation's smaller cities. And I think the survival—and not just that the expansion, the growth—of cities such as Dexter is necessary for the future of America.

That brings me to the substance of my message tonight, which is really two-fold. The first point I would make only reinforces what you, by your presence here tonight, have shown you already know: If you truly want to help make our society a better place in which to live, you will be most effective if you start close to home. It is a point I would press home to the youths who will be using the teen center. The second point is that, while Washington cannot do everything, it can, without becoming heavy-handed, do some things, particularly in rural job development, the keystone to a vital small-town America.

Anyone who watches television knows the litany of national problems that need solving: Vietnam . . . the arms race and what it takes out of every paycheck . . . crime . . . pollution that is choking our cities and killing our lakes and streams . . . urban decay . . . rural decline . . . racial tension . . . hunger.

Because these are nation-wide problems, there is a natural tendency to look for—or wait for—national solutions. It's Washington we see on television all the time. It's Washington that has most of our tax money. It's Washington that makes the big decisions. So leave it to Washington.

There are two things wrong with this approach.

First, having been in Washington for a few months, I am pretty sure that neither the Congress nor the White House—under any Administration—is going to come up with all the answers. There is a lot we in Washington can do, and we can do it a lot better.

But the fact remains that there is not much that can be built from the top down—especially societies.

Secondly, when you leave it to Washington in your own mind, you destroy your initiative. You can grumble, or write your Senator. But as long as you assume the most of the public decisions that affect you have to be made by somebody else, someplace else, you are going to be very ineffective, very frustrated, and, ultimately, very disappointed citizens.

Let me suggest to you tonight that a great many of the most momentous public decisions, so far as your own lives are concerned, are going to be made—or neglected—right here in Stoddard County . . . in the next county court election . . . in the next school board election . . . in the meetings of the Soil and Water Conservation District . . . by the success or failure of the Bootheel Economic Development Council.

You'll never see these decisions reported on national television.

But they are the decisions that will determine to a very large extent what kind of a community you call home.

They will determine whether Dexter grows or shrivels off the map; whether you attract new industry and new jobs, or see your tax base slowly dry up.

It is up to you to decide whether progress will mean taking advantage of the natural beauty all around you, or mean instead choking, concentric rings of motels and hotdog stands; whether you give your teachers first-rate salaries for a first-rate school system, or see more families move away in search of opportunity for their children.

The movement away from small town America is caused primarily by the dwindling number of jobs and economic opportunities in many of our smaller cities. As I have said, it is a problem that must be tackled mostly on the local level, but I think Washington can play an important role, too.

This is why I have co-sponsored a bill, introduced by Senator Jim Pearson of Kansas and Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma, whose aim is to attract new, job-creating industries to rural communities through a program of tax incentives.

I am sure you are all familiar with this legislation, called the Rural Job Development Act of 1969. It is drawing bipartisan support (Senator Pearson is a Republican and Senator Harris, of course, is chairman of the Democratic National Committee). The National Rural Electrification Association has endorsed it. President Nixon has spoken with favor of rural tax incentives.

The Act would create Rural Job Development Areas, which would be restricted to counties that have no cities larger than 50,000 population and in which at least 15 per cent of the families have incomes of under $3,000 a year, or where employment has declined at more than 5 per cent a year during the last five years.

I think it is a sound, proper approach, particularly at a time when many industries are discovering that doing business in the cities is almost prohibitively costly and are in a 'look-around' mood.

People will go—or stay—where the jobs are. Both the quality and the quantity of economic and social opportunities in rural America must be expanded so that those who wish to stay there will be able to do so.

The Rural Job Development Act as now written provides a 15 per cent tax credit on machinery and equipment, a 7 per cent credit on land and buildings. It also contains accelerated depreciation features and deductions for training workers.

Some have argued that the tax incentives are too generous as written. They could be pared down some. But I think industries locating in new communities under the terms of the Act would generate enough jobs—and therefore enough income tax—to offset the loss of tax revenue from the incentives.

In my view, the price paid for rural economic development is an investment in future earnings and future productivity and in the future of our rural communities. I think that this is a price well worth paying.

But in the long range, America desperately needs a reassertion of local self-government . . . of local attention to local needs . . . of local outrage at local injustices . . . of local vision as to what our local communities can and must become.

I am not talking about a step backwards to the good old days when nothing much happened at the county court house and when things were quiet "down on the farm."

I am talking about building the American Society we want in these final decades of the Twentieth Century from the grassroots up. The right answers for you ultimately have to be determined by you—right here.

LETTERS FROM A VIETNAM SOLDIER WHO IS GONE

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, of all the heroes of the Vietnam—or any other war—none can compete with a young man from Knoxville who recently gave his life. I say "gave" for indeed he did without reservation. This young man was above his fellow man in his understanding of life and war and on the eve of the ambush which took his life he wrote to his parents:

I was happier, stronger, smarter, richer, and more satisfied with life, because I knew what life was and what it wasn't.

He wrote two letters on the fateful eve—one to be mailed to his parents, the second to be sent only if he should be killed. Both letters were delivered.

Don Whitehead carried these letters in his column in the Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel, and I insert his article today in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all who read these pages can glimpse into the thoughts and heart of one young American—a truly great American.

The article follows:

DON WHITEHEAD REPORTS ON LETTERS FROM A VIETNAM SOLDIER WHO IS GONE

In a lonely outpost in Vietnam, a young Knoxville soldier barely old enough to vote sat alone in his command post thinking of home, his parents, the meaning of the war on that alien soil, and why he was here. The date was June 4, 1969.

The youth wore the bars of a first lieutenant.

He had volunteered for Army service in 1967 when he was 19. There had been those months of training at Benning and Bragg and Bliss. Basic training. Officer training. And hours of studying the Vietnamese language.

In April of this year he had arrived in Vietnam. He had been assigned as an adviser to a South Vietnamese unit. Now he was at a place called Suar Cat. Out there in the jungle beyond the defense perimeter of the village were the Viet Cong and no one knew when they might strike.

ASSIGNMENT DEMANDING

The young soldier, dark-haired and handsome, wrote two letters as he sat in his command post. The first was a long letter to his parents telling of his experiences and his work with the South Vietnamese troops.

"I walked about 8964.3 miles today through some pretty thick jungle," he wrote. "We're at Suar Cat now, and away from the flat, open fields . . . Back there when we went on patrols we could stop to pick up pineapples, mangoes, breadfruit, bananas, etc. Here there is nothing but vines and trees and all kinds of tangled up green and brown stuff. Boyo-boyo.

"Tonight maybe I'll go on an ambush patrol—we're supposed to particiapte in three night operations a week, minimum. Right now, since I'm the only officer on the team I go on every operation . . .

"You know, the quiet moments are becoming filled with thoughts of home. Of bright lights and the sounds of a modern city. Of stores with rows and rows of shelves packed with bright, clean new products. Of one last chess game and one last hug-and-kiss. Of quiet nights and quiet stars.

"Still, though, those moments are pretty infrequent because of the way I keep busy here . . . We'll be going on operations much more now. And my additional duties as team leader are numerous. I'm the planner, the diplomat, the supervisor, the liaison man, the subtle leader, the combat soldier. I must advise men who have been fighting for 5 or 10 years or more. I can't make mistakes. One mistake would blow it all . . . It's a demanding job.

"But I like it. That's the groovy part. I'm doing something. I'm working at something that I like and that requires my intelligence and ability and imagination and ingenuity. I go to sleep tired at night and wake up early ready to get to work. I'm confident that I'll be able to handle whatever comes up. I'm calm. I'm so calm I amaze myself. I see so many things I can do here . . . It's a challenge and I dig it. It blows my mind a little sometimes. But I dig it . . ."

FOR POSTHUMOUS DELIVERY

The second letter was different. It took longer to write because it was a letter not to be mailed unless the young soldier was killed in action. It was an outpouring from the heart. And the youth wrote in his bold script . . .

"Dear Folks:

"By the time you receive this I know that you will have heard the sad news. And it is sad, but only because everyone will misunderstand it. So I have written to try to clear things up. You see, I don't want anyone to think I would be silly enough to die for nothing. I always was one for getting in the last word, and that's what I plan to do now.

I'm not asking you to rationalize that Vietnam was a good cause for this reason or that reason. I'm asking something harder than that. I'm asking that you take my word that I did nothing in vain, because no one knows more about that than I do. Don't ever ask, 'Why me?' because I'll tell you why right now. To get from point to point, all a man has to do is to take one step at a time, but if he never takes the first step he'll never get there. To preserve freedom it takes a group effort. Groups are made of individuals who take that first step. As long as there are enough people who care enough about freedom to have the courage to take that first step to fight for freedom, freedom will never be lost.

"Yes, there are some disappointments. There are many things I wanted to do, and it's too bad I can't do them. I hate that, in a way, but I have the consolation of knowing that I did what I thought was right and I did it all the way. I didn't hold back. I stood up to be counted, and, for as long as I fought, I fought well. That's all anyone can do.

"Very few people appreciate or are even aware of what a soldier is or does. That's O.K. I never wanted glamour, I just wanted to be a good soldier. As a soldier, I could walk down any street and hold my head high and know that I was at least equal to and probably better than any man I saw, because I backed up my thoughts and words by doing something about them. I was doing my part. Paying my own way. Sort of like paying the mortgage on a house. To stay free you just have to fight once in a while, because someone always wants to take away whatever you've got. I don't mind it, and I'm proud to have done the things I have. It doesn't matter now what the outcome of Vietnam will be (as far as my efforts are concerned) because I fought in good faith and felt that I was working for an ideal. And although the physical effects of my work may be destroyed, something will remain. No one can erase my efforts. If only one person benefits from my action, I will have been a success. I didn't mind the hardships—I asked for them. And, as far as dying is concerned, I preferred to die doing what I know to be my duty than to grow old despising myself because I lacked the courage to answer the call. I think that the way to measure a man is by the total weight of his lifelong good intentions and efforts against that of his bad ones. If good comes out on top, then somewhere along the line that man was a success. I'm sure I can pass that test—I want nothing else, except the last word.

"You see, when I used to tell civilian friends that I was a soldier they always assumed that I was a draftee. When I corrected their misconceptions, they always assumed that I was stupid. But I have the last word now, and I shall correct them once and for all. Joining the Army to fight in Vietnam (that is why I joined, and from the start I knew I'd go there—I volunteered for it) was the smartest thing I ever did. It emancipated me from a dream world and put me into action. That one decision made me a man (like baptism of desire). I decided to back up my lifelong ideals. After I got in the Army, I learned things that made me a better man, but April 17, 1967, was the day I became one.

"And so it is, in my final analysis, that I was right, and they were wrong. I die a free man, a strong man, a proud man. That's all there ever was to be. I fought for these things, never for a foolish idea such as 'eternal peace.' So I won all the marbles. I'm a winner. The ones who were afraid, or greedy, or too stupid to see the truth are the losers—even if they're still 'alive.' I lived more in 21 years than they'll live in 100. I was happier, stronger, smarter, richer, and more satisfied with life, because I knew what life was and what it wasn't. And I know what life was for—so I lived it to the fullest in my own way. Because that's the only way.

NOT SORRY FOR ANYTHING

"The whole point is that I am not one bit sorry for anything. Don't you be either. I'm happy because I have everything I ever wanted. I just thought things would be better if you knew this. And, I wanted to tell you that of everything I ever had, I am proudest of my family. I love each one of you very much, and I think you are the most wonderful people in the world. I know that each of you will always live life as you see it, and never forsake your dreams."

The next day—on June 5—the Viet Cong ambushed the young lieutenant's patrol. He fell, mortally wounded.

And thus ended a true profile in courage.

NATIONAL AIR EXPOSITION AT DULLES AIRPORT OVERWHELMING SUCCESS

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Second National Air Exposition, held at Dulles Airport August 15, 16, and 17, drew an estimated half million people who witnessed the most successful undertaking of this type ever staged in the United States.

But, the overwhelming success of the exposition did not come easily, and recognition must go to the Departments of Defense, Transportation, Commerce, the White House, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration whose cooperation and assistance made the entire operation possible.

Beyond the assistance of these Government departments and agencies, Mr. Speaker, is the one-man ability of National Aviation Club Vice President George Thomas who was general chairman of the air exposition. Mr. Thomas also is manager of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce's Washington, D.C., office, a post he has held for the past 22 years.

Mr. Thomas' organizational talent was clearly demonstrated by the success of the show. However, the carefully pieced-together exposition did not achieve that success without many hours of hard and diligent attention to deeply diverse details.

The honorary committee, consisting of a membership of eight Senators and five Representatives and chaired by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS), also deserves commendation for their work in making the air exposition such a success.

In the competition of aviation throughout the world, Americans can be proud of their air exposition and thankful to men like George Thomas and the National Aviation Club for their untiring efforts.

POOR FEAR REPRISALS IN KNOX

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Whitesburg, Letcher County (Ky.) Mountain Eagle, July 10, 1969]

POOR FEAR REPRISALS IN KNOX

(By Mary Walton)

BARBOURVILLE.—A small woman in her mid-50's, and black, Dovie Thompson once supported her children and diabetic husband by cooking, cleaning and doing laundry for people in town.

Now, in the morning, she gathers small leaves in her front yard, which she copperplates at the Knox County Economic Opportunity Council workshop, transforming them into delicate, handpainted pins, earrings and necklaces to be sold at the Knox County Anti-Poverty Arts and Crafts Store.

A few days ago Mrs. Thompson stood at her work table, polishing the metallic leaves to a soft lustre. Around her, other workers were upholstering furniture and making "hillbilly" rag dolls for the store.

"The Governor's giving us a hard time," she said. "Were getting along real well if he'll just let us stay." As she spoke of better times when she and her husband used to own a garage, a tear rolled down her cheek. "If they take the program away," she said, "I don't know what I'll do."

Sooner or later employees and trainees of the Knox County Economic Opportunity Council (KCEOC) usually get around to talking about what's worrying them these days—the survival of the KCEOC under the Nunn Administration.

In an area known as Stinking Creek, Burchell Sizemore, a former welfare recipient now employed by KCEOC as a "center coordinator," drove a visitor over bone-jarring mountain roads past houses without electricity and running water, pointing out those which had undergone recent repairs in a federal home improvement project. He echoed Mrs. Thompson's concern. "If they take the program out, they might just as well take the people with it."

At the Messer Community Center—formerly a one-room school which community people have remodeled and expanded—where Head Start classes were in session, a group of well behaved five-year-olds played with blocks and delved into trunks of dress-up clothes. In the next room cooks were preparing a lunch of beef stew, peas, sliced peaches and milk for 30 children, some of whom might have little else to eat that day. "If they could visit up the hollows," Mrs. Helen Hobbs, the lead teacher, said quietly, "I think they'd change their minds."

An aide offered the opinion that recent opposition to the Knox County anti-poverty agency came from "the people in town that's got plenty of money . . . these people that don't need it."

Some of the people in town—county Republican leaders like County Judge William Sears and Cecil Wilson, editor of the *Barbourville Advocate*—say the Knox County Economic Opportunity Council, a federally-financed community action agency, is in serious trouble over a mule.

Governor Louie B. Nunn, they say, was needlessly provoked and embarrassed by the poor people's gift to the Republican governors at their recent conference in Lexington—shares in a mule named "Hope." Earlier, each of the governors had received a share in a $70,000 race horse from the Kentucky Thoroughbred Breeders Association.

The gesture was a protest and attempt to develop a job. You have to do the two things simultaneously.

Working is also an integral part of the Emergency Food Program, perhaps the only one in the country which requires able individuals to work for food stamp vouchers issued when a family is without other resources.

Recipients are not resentful about working, said Mrs. Sharon Davis, supervisor of the Emergency Food and Medical Services Program, because "to them it means so much more than when it's being given to them. As long as they say, 'I'm working,' it's not a handout."

In addition, KCEOC conducts early childhood training for 200 children and adult education classes for 217 people. Three former students now attend college full-time.

Altogether, the agency estimates that 4,000-5,000 people are involved in one or another of its activities.

But, says West, "A program's not worth a dime if it's not used for community organization."

The backbone of the Economic Opportunity Council, say the staff, is the Association of Local Action Groups, or LAGs, of which there are 13 scattered over Knox County.

Open to anyone who wishes to join, LAGs have gotten roads, street lights, mail and telephone service, and road signs for their communities. They've also raised money to build and repair LAG centers and construct the Arts and Crafts Store.

LAGs have the responsibility for selecting CEP trainees and homes to be repaired under the Home Improvement Program. Finally, the Association of LAGs sets goals for the KCEOC—most recently "more jobs"—and elects nine of the 27-member board of directors.

West looks forward to a non-profit Knox County Community Development Corporation—incorporated last May—in which poor people will own at least 60 percent of the stock. With stock sales and profits from existing businesses, the Corporation could finance new ones, providing experienced management and technical information.

In his office in the Barbourville Municipal Building, down the hall from the Mayor's office and the Chamber of Commerce, West recently asked the reason for jeopardizing these ambitious antipoverty activities with what some people regarded as no more than a prank.

Presenting the mule, West answered, was important because "poor people in Kentucky have never had a success in terms of being listened to, and the mule tended to dramatize that kind of thing."

"Unless somebody'd done something about it," West said, "those Area Development Districts would eventually control all federal funds that come in here. I got a feeling that now it's going to be much more difficult for that Board to have any kind of solid control without at least having the involvement of poor people and their ideas put in there." Poor people currently involved in Knox County's self-help projects are among its most fervent supporters. Perhaps because, as Dovie Thompson said at the workshop, they "feel better."

"A lot of people in this community had lost their dignity. They feel proud, they feel like they're needed."

"That's how I feel."

THIRTY YEARS AFTER THE INVASION OF POLAND, PEACE IS NO CLOSER THAN IT WAS ON SEPTEMBER 1, 1939

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Monday marked the 30th anniversary of the beginning of World War II.

It is ironic that as we observe this 30th anniversary of the invasion of Poland we find that the world is no closer to peace today than it was three decades ago when Nazi troops triggered World War II.

It is an even further height of irony that during these three decades, the Soviet Union, through its hypocrisy, deceit, chicanery, subversion, and aggression has forced the United States to expend more than $2 trillion in defense expenditures to preserve the balance of deterrents against major war.

And even as we mark the 30th anniversary of World War II—it could not have been started without Soviet infamy—we find the Soviet Union today continuing to create vast turmoil throughout the world.

One has a right to ask as we observe this 30th anniversary at what point is the free world going to finally realize that there can be no compromise with Soviet treachery?

The $2 trillion that the United States has had to spend on defense armament in these three decades is only part of the tragic story. We have no estimate on the total number of lives that have been lost in these three decades of conflict inspired by the Soviet Union.

Nor can anyone estimate the volume of privation that continues throughout the world because the evil forces of communism have blocked an orderly process toward resolving most of these social problems.

Hitler could not and would not have started World War II by plunging his forces into Poland on the morning of September 1, 1939, if he did not have in his pocket the infamous Ribbentrop-

Molotov agreement which divided Europe between the Soviets and the Nazis.

On this 30th anniversary of the beginning of World War II, the Soviet Union cannot escape its full share of the blame for this holocaust that took so many lives.

It was the height of Soviet deceit the other day to hear Communist leaders proclaim the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement as a great diplomatic victory which gave Russia 2 additional years to arm against the Nazis.

This is the kind of rot that we have got used to hearing from Moscow and gives us a clue as to the degree of intellectual honesty that continues to exist in the Kremlin.

The Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement was the key to launching World War II and no matter how desperately the Communists try to cleanse themselves of their full share of responsibility, the fact remains that the conspiracy hatched by the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement continues to this day.

The Soviet Union is today the principal supplier of arms to North Vietnam and continues to pressure Hanoi into continuing the war in Vietnam.

The Soviet Union has rearmed all the Arab States and is coercing them into continuing their aggression against Israel.

The Soviet Union has rearmed North Korea in violation of every one of the truce agreement terms negotiated in Korea 15 years ago.

The Soviet fleet continues to harass the American fleet in the Mediterranean.

The Soviet Union has proclaimed publicly that it will crush any resistance to communism in the captive nations of Europe.

Finally, the Soviet Union is now starting its intrigues and subversion in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, on this tragic 30th anniversary of World War II, it would be my hope that all of our citizens, as well as the people who love freedom throughout the world, would realize that there can be no lasting peace and that indeed World War II itself was a tragic effort so long as the treachery and deceit and subversion of the Soviet Union's international conspiracy is permitted to continue to flourish.

Those who during these 30 tragic years have sought to persuade us that there is some hope of coexistence with the Communists ought to look at the tragic record of these three decades.

The Soviet Union has succeeded in keeping the whole world in turmoil for three decades and there is no reason to believe nor is there an iota of evidence that the Kremlin has reached that point in time when it wants to abandon its international conspiracy and live at peace with the world.

We can never absolve the Nazis for the horrors of World War II but we should also never forget that the Nazis and the Communists were coequal partners in this monstrous attack on world peace and the Communists must continue to assume their full share of blame for this tragedy.

EDITORIAL DIALOG ON PRESIDENT NIXON'S BOLD WELFARE REFORM PROPOSAL

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, during the coming weeks and months Congress and the American people will have an opportunity to debate, digest, and evaluate the bold proposals which President Nixon has made to achieve much-needed reform of our Nation's welfare system. There are few who would disagree with the President's conclusion:

America's welfare system is a failure that grows worse every day.

The recommendations of the Nixon administration to effect welfare reform have stimulated editorial comments, both pro and con. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials which are representative of the dialog now being conducted on the welfare proposals in the Kansas Fourth Congressional District:

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle]

BOLD PROPOSAL TO REFORM WELFARE WOULD ERASE MANY FLAWS

President Nixon's proposal for sweeping reforms in the welfare system is a bold approach to a problem that certainly needs solving.

The $4-billion additional it is expected to cost is a lot of money, but presumably the work training programs provided will rehabilitate some welfare recipients and the cost will go down.

The program isn't likely to go through Congress without change, but if it is passed in a reasonable facsimile of its present form, it will do much to erase the many shortcomings of a system that has grown unsystematically over the years.

Its primary advantages would be that it would provide national welfare minimum payments, promote family stability, expand job training and day-care, provide work incentives and help the working poor.

All of these areas have been cited as flaws in the present welfare system.

Another provision is a sharing of a percentage of federal revenue with the states.

This has long been a suggestion of many Americans who believe the federal government, with its sophisticated tax collection apparatus, should share with the states which must confront increasingly complex problems.

The chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, a man who has firm control of the nation's purse strings, has said this part of the President's program may have tough sledding.

Undoubtedly other parts will also get close scrutiny in a Democratically controlled Congress.

Nevertheless, the program is a start in an area that both Republicans and Democrats know needs overhauling.

It will simply have to be hammered out in a compromise between Congress and the Administration.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News]

NIXON BREAKS SILENCE

What a shock it is.

President Nixon delivered his broadside on the crisis in public welfare, and the sound was his, all right, but the words were right out of that reconstructed and revolutionary Democrat, Daniel P. Moynihan.

One could hardly be more surprised were Ev Dirksen suddenly to sing soprano.

As James Reston noted on this page Monday, Nixon has now repudiated his own party's record on social policy. He has stated an unusually progressive welfare policy in conservative language, and in so doing, Reston adds, he "proposes more welfare, more people on public assistance, which will take more federal funds, than any other president in the history of the Republic."

The President aims to switch and fight. Interesting as this is for its political by-play, it is even more interesting for the President's determination to come to grips with what he calls a "colossal failure" in our welfare system.

What most of us have heard about welfare programs the past few years has come from two sources: 1—those expressing outrage of tax-supported illegitimacy, immorality and loafing by welfare recipients; 2—the more militant recipients themselves, demanding their rights."

Moynihan set out to report the full story of the system a half-dozen years ago. Before Nixon's election, he blasted "the horror of welfare reality," and called for changes on much the same line as those the President has now urged.

The new effort is controversial. Some have found racism in Nixon's approach. Big city officials are little help for their poverty programs. Many have concern over how Southern states will spend federal welfare money handed them without strings.

But for now, it is heartening that the President has broken the long official silence on our welfare system. All political shades, from liberal to conservative, will welcome that.

[From the McPherson (Kans.) Sentinel]

WANTS WELFARE PEOPLE TO ACCEPT OFFERED JOBS

President Nixon's proposed changes in our welfare program are a little too complicated and too general for most of us to understand fully, but two points are very clear: 1. Give states more authority in managing welfare problems and transfer federal funds to them to pay for the work. 2. Stop welfare payments to any man or woman who refuses to accept any job offered by welfare authorities.

No. 1 answers many a complaint about the federal government invading the rights of states. The proposal might be the start in giving these powers back to the states and could save tax money.

No. 2 hits at the heart of the worst welfare abuses in stopping welfare payments to any person who refuses to take a job when offered one. Under the present plan, too many on welfare have found it easier to starve on relief than to work when given the chance. This is one of the biggest reasons that the number of people drawing welfare checks has doubled in the past 10 years.

The goal is sound. May there be a way found to dig up the extra $4 billion or so a year the new plan may cost.

[From the Halstead (Kans.) Independent]

MORE FEDERAL POWER

Officials of the federal government as well as some state officials seem intent on changing the Republic into a total welfare state.

The latest proposal of President Nixon if enacted in its entirety would make this the greatest welfare nation in the world. Welfare of any kind is a bad situation. To those who have worked hard all of their lives, they have little generosity to give those people a living just because they are lazy.

This nation was founded on hard work and thrift. For the past 35 years the federal government through its officials have tried to change all this. Doles have been created for farmers, aid to dependent children and welfare for the poor.

Already the welfare system has set up such an empire that those living off of it have no desire to do anything else. Many families went on welfare in the WPA days. When better times came a big part chose to remain on welfare. Now there are several generations that know nothing but welfare.

Intent of the welfare program is noble. Its only problem is that the program as proposed expands it rather than cuts it down. Welfare or a welfare state as proposed by our president is contrary to the growth and basic ideals of this nation.

Should this Federalism spread in the welfare program as proposed by President Nixon it would be the biggest blow ever struck against the Republic. With a "Federal Welfare" program firmly established do gooders would attempt to spread this new theory to other walks of life. Soon the nation would be enmeshed in total "Federal Control" which would be far more restrictive than even in communistic countries.

Whenever a nation taxes its people as heavily as this nation is now doing the federal power over the individual becomes enormous.

Is there no stopping the trend before the republic is destroyed?

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) Record]

NIXON'S WELFARE PLANS

We have listened with interest * * * welfare reform and must admit that we have mixed feelings about them. There are some points in the program which we believe should have been tried long ago. But there are other points that left us cold. This is to be expected. No program that embraces such wide areas as the massive welfare system could please everyone on all points.

We agree with the President on the overall failure of the welfare programs of the past. They have proven their own ineffectiveness. The welfare rolls grow, with no end in sight. We agree, too, with the concept of trying to keep a father in the house. Children need the guidance and the influence of a father.

We agree with the job training provisions of the President's proposal. We prefer seeing our taxes used to provide career training that would eventually place welfare recipients on private company payrolls. This would make taxpayers of them, and possibly eliminate the dole and other forms of handouts that degrade human beings.

We will be quick to complain if the President should default on his proposal "that all employable persons who choose to accept these payments be required to register for work or job training, provided suitable jobs are available either locally or if transportation is provided." Though this is a compromise proposal, it is at least a beginning on the right road.

We are skeptical of the other proposals. Such points as the basic income for all families is quite similar to the guaranteed annual income to which we are opposed. But for the moment, we take the positive view and emphasize the parts of the plan we can support. We will be watching, along with millions of other Americans in the coming months as the plan is brought before the Congress. If the welfare program works, we will all be the beneficiaries. If it fails, we will have to seek other solutions. But at least we will have tried. That in itself is progress.

ON MRS. NIXON OUT ON HER OWN

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during our recent recess the Nation was treated to a unique television program, unique because it involved for the first time as First Lady, Mrs. Richard Nixon, known fondly to a generation of Americans as "Pat."

On August 12, columnist Royce Brier of the San Francisco Chronicle had an interesting commentary on this wonderful lady. I include it in the RECORD because I know others in the Congress and across the country will want to read Mr. Brier's remarks also:

ON MRS. NIXON OUT ON HER OWN

(By Royce Brier)

Modern communications lift the woman known colloquially as the "First Lady" into the public light in a way impossible in the last century. This was disclosed on television Sunday evening in a half-hour narration by Mrs. Richard Nixon of her trip around the world.

Further, the program gave evidence of the profound effect a President's wife can have on her husband's national standing.

Washington and Lincoln were perhaps exceptions. They were so preeminent their wives hardly touched their careers. Martha Washington, still largely unknown, was a colonial dame who kept her place. Mary Lincoln was a protean figure whose husband turned out to be of such immense stature that she has become a passing oddity.

In our time we have known three extraordinary wives, Jacqueline Kennedy, Ladybird Johnson and Eleanor Roosevelt. We appear to have been glamorized into unreality in our view of the then Mrs. Kennedy. Mrs. Johnson had such eminent good sense as in some measure to counterpoise her husband's sagging fortunes. Mrs. Roosevelt was probably the most remarkable of the White House wives, because she was seldom there.

For six months Mrs. Nixon's image (that word!) resisted efforts of the news media to make her interesting.

Everybody acquainted with her knows her as a woman of fine character and high intelligence. But she has been seen as a passive figure, in public appearances always calmly beside her husband, yet only an adjunct of the Presidential presence.

What she has lacked publicly is animation, but this is a tricky apparition. It may be interpreted as inability to project personality, which is passivity, or as true modesty. These are widely differing traits, though they often wear the same guise. We know that from our everyday experience, people who seem aloof at first glance, but are not aloof when known.

This television program should alter some impressions many Americans have had for the year Mrs. Nixon has been in the public eye.

First, it was skillfully paced and proportioned, in a half-hour instead of an hour. We had foreknowledge Mrs. Nixon would be impeccable in action and attitude, but we did not know how she would transcend this social value. And that she did.

She displayed a moving feeling for humble human beings, people who have lost in life, or never had a chance, retarded children, orphaned children, desperately wounded American soldiers. The faces of these people as she bent over them and took their hands glowed with a light which forestalled any cynical efforts to see her visits as inspired by self-interest. She was other than studious of how she would appear.

Then when she talked, explaining her approach to differing scenes in differing places, you perceived she was not aloof at all, but a warm hearted concerned woman in a part of the world where all does not come up roses.

This is of course but one person's viewpoint, but it must be said as a duty in interpreting events. As further interpretation, it is submited here that, whatever the political profit of the Presidential journey, the human profit is incalculable, due chiefly to Mrs. Nixon's own concept of, and response to, the task put before her.

WE ARE LOSING

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a constituent forwarded to me an editorial from the Richmond News Leader, a daily newspaper serving my congressional district, and stated that it was well worth reading.

In my opinion the editorial, entitled "We Are Losing," which discusses our declining military position in relation to the Soviet Union, is worth consideration by the entire Congress. Therefore, I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD:

WE ARE LOSING

If the United States Navy were to lose ten per cent of its ships and personnel in battle and if the enemy were then recognized as the world's dominant sea power, the American people would be stunned. Yet last week's announcement of such an impending loss stirred hardly a ripple on our somnolent summer scene. The Navy, we learn, is to be decimated as a result of a $3 billion Defense Department budget cut imposed by Congress; the fleet will shortly be reduced from 900 to 800 ships on active duty and Navy personnel will be axed by 72,000 men, down to 700,000. In the confusion of our time, many befuddled liberals now regard the so-called military-industrial complex, once hailed as the arsenal and guardian of free men everywhere, as a greater menace than the Communists.

This Naval disaster dramatizes and confirms a revolution in world sea-power wherein the United States has drifted from unchallenged supremacy to second place behind the Soviet Union.

During the past eight years our government has concentrated its attention and resources on the war in Vietnam—a war that it refuses to win and that the Communists find profitable to continue. While we have thus been bogged down, the Russians have raced ahead for the big payoff in naval and nuclear superiority.

Already the United States and its NATO allies are being challenged by Russian naval might in the Mediterranean. With more than 60 ships there, Soviet strength is greater than the United States Sixth Fleet. Meanwhile, Communist influence and Russian naval support bases have been extended from Syria and Egypt in the Middle East all across North Africa to Algeria, in a vast pincer designed to strangle Western Europe.

RUSSIANS HOLD

Admiral H. G. Rickover, the father of our nuclear submarine fleet, recently warned that the Soviets now have by far the largest submarine force in the world—about 375 submarines, all built since World War II. We have 143, including 61 diesel submarines, most of which are of World War II vintage. Thus the Russians now have a net advantage of about 230 submarines and will launch 28 new undersea units this year. By comparison, the United States will launch only one or two new subs. Admiral Rickover estimates that by the end of 1970, the Soviet Union will gain a numerical lead over the United States in *nuclear* submarines. *Next year!*

Russian superiority is not confined to submarines. The Soviets have armed their destroyers and other surface vessels with surface-to-surface atomic missiles having a range of 100 miles or more. We have no surface vessels carrying atomic missiles.

Admiral Rickover goes on:

"In the single year of 1968, the Soviets put to sea a new type ballistic missile nuclear-powered submarine as well as several new types of nuclear attack submarines—a feat far exceeding anything we have ever done. It is estimated that by 1974 they will have added about 70 nuclear-powered submarines to their fleet, whereas we will add about 26—thus further increasing their superiority."

UNITED STATES MORE VULNERABLE

The submarine has become the blue-chip weapon of the atomic age. Its mission is no longer restricted to sinking surface ships. The Polaris-type submarine, with its long-range, nuclear-tipped missiles, brings the principal cities and military installations of the enemy homeland into its crosshairs. Clearly, in warfare's new dimension, geography has made the United States much more vulnerable than the Soviet Union, largely shielded from the open seas by other nations; the American people are concentrated in major cities along the Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific coasts—now all but defenseless against instant destruction from submarine-launched hydrogen bombs.

Apparently very little thought has been given the fact that the wide oceans, which once isolated us from foreign foes, have become broad avenues of peril. Small wonder that our Central Intelligence Agency is so concerned about Kremlin plans to have fleets of missile submarines prowling permanently all along U.S. coasts—enemy units always on the move, units that cannot be tracked by radar or by sight. Small wonder the Pentagon is concerned that the Russians are expanding their Cuban naval installations in order to provision their missile submarines stationed off our shores.

LOOKING DOWN A GUN

We shall soon be looking down a Communist gun barrel. The 15–20 minute warning period that the Pentagon once counted on with any missile fired from the Soviet Union will be so greatly reduced by the presence of nearby enemy submarines that no response may be possible before all our retaliatory missiles and our cities are destroyed in a surprise sub-based missile attack. In such an eventuality, only our own missile submarines could respond. But the Soviets may gamble that their extensive anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defenses would neutralize this potential punishment. Our military leaders, who have recognized this unthinkable threat, have spoken only in guarded terms for fear of panicking the public.

Instead of reducing the Navy, the Nixon Administration and the Congress should forthwith embark on a crash program to construct not fewer than 75 nuclear submarines equipped with Poseidon missiles. We should also concentrate on developing more effective anti-submarine warfare techniques. For, if this is to be the arena where Russia plans to win World War III, we dare not be unprepared.

The stakes could not be higher. The Soviet Union is bidding for nothing less than world control through either blackmail, subversion or military conquest. Our own goal is more modest: It is simply national survival.

COMPENSATION FOR WIDOW OF A MILITARY RETIREE

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, as many of you know, I have introduced H.R. 6226 which would provide for the widow of a military retiree to receive an annuity just as the widow of a civil service employee does. My bill would correct a long-standing injustice which has been done to servicemen and military retirees.

Recently an interesting article was published in the Long Beach Independent & Press-Telegram which was written by Alma Kirkland. I believe it properly describes the human aspects of the great injustice which has been done to servicemen and their surviving spouses. I recommend that all persons interested in justice read the following article:

IN NAVY CIRCLES WIDOWS LIVE LONELY, STARK LIVES

(By Alma Kirkland)

The loss of a husband is personal tragedy . . . the loss of an income is often the forerunner of poverty.

"It has been referred to as 'genteel poverty' where the retired service wife is concerned," said Mrs. Dorothy Anne Fickes (Lt. Cmdr. Ted, ret.), president of Officers' Wives and Widows Club.

"It is commonly assumed that the widows of retired servicemen automatically receive their husbands pension—and this includes many service people themselves," declared Dorothy Anne.

Not true!

According to the Fleet Reserve Association, the military retiree is the only federal employee that does not have an equitable survivor annuity plan, unless they die of a service-connected physical defect.

"I'm a nurse. You can't tell me that a man serving in World War One and World War Two doesn't have battle scars . . . even if they don't show. Heart attacks and strokes don't just happen overnight," said Dorothy Anne.

She is spreading the word about the Widow's Equity Bill—H.R. 6226 which Congressman Charles S. Gubser is presenting to the 91st Congress.

This bill, sponsored by the F.R.A. will provide benefits to widows in the manner of Civil Service.

"It is not aid. The husbands will pay into it like any other annuity plan," Dorothy Anne emphasized.

"This bill is perfect for the wives who unknowingly face this lonely future," she said . . . but, "it will not effect all the thousands of women who are presently in this situation."

Dorothy, thankfully, has her husband beside her, but her friend, Mrs. Hervey Z. Throop, who resides in Medford, N.J. is not so lucky.

Mrs. Throop writes: "I know those already widowed are not included in the bill but have hopes it will be changed as time goes on. I would appreciate help, in fact I need it and, no doubt others do, too."

The 75-year-old widow continues: "At the present time I am packing blueberries, which means work from 7 a.m. to 7 or 8 p.m. I like the work, but I get very tired."

Another friend, Mrs. Mary Redfield Anderson, has been twice widowed. Her first husband was a casualty in World War One.

"In those days things were different. I didn't receive any insurance or benefits,' says Mary.

Left with a son to rear, Mary worked as a bookkeeper. She later married CWO August Anderson, USCG, a veteran of the Spanish American War and World War One.

He retired at age 64 and they lived comfortably until his death five years ago.

"I do get a pension of $70 a month (my rent is $80) because of a special bill passed by congress for widows of men who had served in the Spanish American War.

"There was no insurance when he died because he had cashed it in to pay for our home. I have had to sell the house in order to live.

"Every month I go to the bank and draw out enough money for food and expenses. I am down to the last $1500 and I don't know what I'll do when that is gone," she sighed.

Mary, who will be 75 in August, baby sits when her health will allow it. She is diabetic and struggles with high blood-pressure which caused a recent stroke.

"My son said, 'Mom, you know when you can't make it on your own you always have a home with us.' But I don't want that! He has all he can do to make ends meet now," said the spunky widow.

Alternatives?

"Welfare? Don't know anything about that. I suppose if nothing changes I'll have to find out—but, it's going to be an awful hurt to my pride," she said, her voice trailing sadly.

Mary is one of thousands.

Dorothy Anne believes they can be helped.

"There is a Society of Military Widows in Coronado. All widows who won't be helped by this new legislation should join. Their united strength cannot be ignored," she declared.

If you are a military widow who needs help, or one more fortunate who wants to fight for additional legislation write: Society of Military Widows, Mrs. Ellen Heissel, 3226 Kingsley St., San Diego.

THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NAZI INVASION OF POLAND

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, September 1 marked the 30th anniversary of the Nazi invasion of Poland. It is fitting that we carefully remember those events of 30 years ago and their consequences for an overpowered but gallant people.

Poland has long suffered from being the beacon of democratic tradition in a totalitarian environment. Invaded from west and east, Poland has repeatedly felt the loss of territory, people, and even existence as a state.

The Nazis carried out an unprovoked lightning attack on Poland in 1939. Poland, however, was not without friends and the most devastating war of mankind flamed across four continents. Poland paid a heavy price for its determination to honor its heritage and remain free. Collusion between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union allowed both powers to divide up large sections of Poland without respect to national identity. Over 10 million Poles were uprooted from their homes or were casualties of that war.

The history of Poland has often been tragic. The spirit of the Polish people, however, has remained steadfast. Their contributions to science, art, education, and religion have gone beyond the boundaries of one nation. While all mankind is immeasurably richer from their gifts, the people of the United States are especially grateful to our citizens of Polish ancestry. During the Revolutionary War, during the World Wars, in the expansion of our frontier, and the development of our industry, Polish Americans have made significant contributions. Today the 10 million Americans of Polish ancestry continue to add strength and patriotism to our society.

Mr. Speaker, it is not enough simply to take note of this anniversary and the contributions of Polish peoples to our country. Indeed, we must translate these lessons of history into policies recommitting us to the fundamental freedoms of man.

ACQUISITION AND CONTROL OF LAND FOR THE MINNESOTA EXPERIMENTAL CITY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the concept of a brand new city presents many opportunities in terms of land acquisition and control.

If the proposed new city were substantially removed from an area under current development, the land could be acquired at modest prices through eminent domain. Similarly modest prices would be entailed if surplus lands already in the public domain were acquired. Either type of acquisition would preclude the tremendous rise in land cost associated with speculators who obtain property at acreage rates and sell them at frontal footage rates.

With the public ownership of all of the land in the experimental city, the increases in land value caused by development could be used to pay for a substantial amount of public expenditures for schools, roads, sewers, and so forth. In addition, experimentation could be undertaken on various forms of ownership and taxation.

Following is a discussion of land acquisition and public ownership, extracted from volume II of the Minnesota Experimental City Progress Report, dated May 1969:

LAND ACQUISITION

Isolated plots of land in northern Minnesota can presently be purchased for between $50 and $100 per acre. Assuming the $100 per acre price, 100 square miles could be obtained for slightly over $6 million, a relatively low figure. However, once the intentions of the City's sponsors became apparent, land prices could be expected to skyrocket. To avoid this, two options are open. The City could obtain land either by eminent domain or from surplus government lands.

There is currently no law permitting eminent domain for new cities, either at the federal or state level. The City's best chance is for passage of such a law at the state level since federal legislation for this purpose appears unlikely in the near future.

The laws governing the disposition of federal lands are clear. These lands are first open to any public agency that chooses to bid for them. They must be sold at a fair market price except when used for school or park purposes. The advantage of buying from the federal government is that the monopoly threat private land holders might exercise would not be a factor. Though red tape would undoubtedly create delays, restrictions presently inhibiting the use of federal lands for new cities could probably be overcome.

LAND OWNERSHIP

Public land ownership in new cities is generally advocated on three grounds:

1. It allows the public to benefit from land value increments.

2. It facilitates regulation and control of land use.

3. It is more equitable, as special groups would not directly benefit from such public improvements as new roads.

There are numerous recent examples of developers retaining ownership of vast developed tracts of land. Stanford University Industrial Park is among the more successful ventures of this type. Through retained ownership, the developer is able, over time, to capture the land value increments generated by development.

In a new city with 250,000 population, the infrastructure cost for roads, schools, sewers, etc. might run as high $3 billion. Capturing the land value increment might, in time, pay between fifty percent and one hundred percent of the infrastructure cost.

The prospect of land value increases serves as an attraction for industries, businesses, and residents alike. To the extent that the Experimental City encounters difficulty in establishing an economic base, withdrawing speculative incentives could thwart the City's development. To overcome this, subsidies may have to be offered industries, diminishing the advantages of retained land ownership.

To determine the magnitude of the incentive exerted by the possibility of speculative gain, an analysis by industry could be performed. Clearly some industries would be found to benefit from a controlled price situation, others to suffer.

It would be naive to assume that land controls would be easy to enforce under a system of public land ownership. Long term leases would probably be required to provide sufficient stability to attract most land users. During the lease period, governmental controls may not be any more effective than under private land ownership. At the time of lease expiration, considerable political pressure could be anticipated from vested interests trying to influence the disposition of the land. In this sense, the government's freedom might be restricted, requiring the appropriate governmental agency to demonstrate impartial treatment to all leaseholders.

Public ownership could reduce the prospect of windfall gains to selected owners, and this is a strong point in its favor. If it could be demonstrated that public ownership would not seriously hamper the City's development through reducing speculative incentives and the participation of land speculators, this type of experiment should be encouraged.

The present land tax system is an alternative to public ownership. This system has the advantage of allowing speculation without rigid controls while permitting the public to benefit from development. Its disadvantage lies in penalizing those who improve their property while those who do not, who leave their land vacant, are able to prosper through speculation. If the land tax system were altered to exempt new buildings, its worst feature would be curbed, but so would revenues.

Since the requirements for land vary by industry, several forms of land ownership or taxing probably should prevail throughout the City. This assumes the Experimental City is not treated as a national facility, in which case the character of land ownership would be predetermined. Areas might be set aside in the City where experimental forms of ownership, of taxation, and of land use controls would be permitted.

COMMISSIONING OF U.S.S. "SPADEFISH"

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on August 14, 1969, I had the honor of delivering the address on the occasion of the commissioning of the U.S.S. *Spadefish*, SSN-668, at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., in Newport News, Va.

I took this opportunity to call attention to the Soviet naval challenge to this country and the need for us to maintain a strong nuclear attack force if we are to maintain our traditional mastery of the seas.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that these remarks may be of some interest to my colleagues, and I therefore insert them in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

We are assembled here today to commission a significant addition to our nation's naval strength, the nuclear attack submarine USS *Spadefish*, SSN 668. This is both a joyous occasion and a solemn one. It is a time for celebration and for reflection.

The captain of the *Spadefish* and the ship's company may be reflecting at this moment that it was almost 200 years ago, in these very waters, that America won her independence. Naval power made possible the victory at Yorktown. In 1781 George Washington stressed the need for what he termed "constant Naval superiority."

The American Revolution might have failed without our intrepid sailors. Yet only four years later, in 1785, the demands for economy and the denunciations of our "military-industrial establishment" were such that the last ship of the Continental Navy was sold. An outcry was heard against the Navy that was so vociferous that an anti-military propaganda campaign forced the George Washington Administration to end naval appropriations.

Then, in the mid-1790's, America realized that a nation without a credible naval deterrent would suffer an ignominious fate. The pirates of North Africa insulted the American flag. We managed to find the appropriations for completion of three new frigates, the *Constellation*, the *Constitution*, and the *United States*.

But construction was halted on three other frigates the Navy required, the *President*, the *Congress*, and the *Chesapeake*, the latter at the Gosport shipyard that later became the Norfolk Naval Shipyard at Portsmouth. Construction was resumed only when we got into a quasi-war with France.

These six historic frigates, built despite the pressures of those who said we did not need such heavily-gunned and sturdy vessels, enabled us to cope with the French, the Corsairs of the Barbary Coast and then the British in the War of 1812. The *Constellation* proved to be the mainstay for the valiant defense of Norfolk. The *Constitution*, better known as "Old Ironsides," remains in commission today. It is the oldest ship on the Navy list, just as *Spadefish* is the newest. The *Constitution* is a symbol not only of courage and patriotism but of another time in our history when men of vision insisted on making provision for our Navy.

The Commanding Officer of the Soviet Navy, Admiral Gorshkov, has thrown down a challenge, in word and deed. He has stated that "the flag of the Soviet Navy now proudly flies over all the seas of the world. Sooner or later the United States will have to understand it no longer has mastery of the sea."

The actions of the Soviet Navy include submarine exercises off our coasts in recent weeks, both off our Atlantic coast and in the Gulf of Mexico. Our answer to such provocative instrusions is the commissioning of *Spadefish*. The *Spadefish* carries not only the latest anti-submarine warfare weapons system but the kind of reply that the Russians understand.

President Nixon has just visited Romania. Like our astronauts who landed on the moon "in peace for all mankind," our President seeks nothing more than understanding, coexistence, and peace with all nations.

I am sure that every member of the *Spadefish*'s company, their families, and every person here today shares the peaceful commitment of our President. He speaks for the American people. We are not an aggressive or predatory people who threaten or subjugate others. But we are a proud people. We are a dedicated people. And we are conscious that there are in this world hostile forces that desire our destruction and would not hesitate to strike if we showed fear, weakness, and timidity.

Our answer, while offering the hand of peace, is to commission the *Spadefish*. It is a killer submarine, superquiet, deep-diving, and swift. Its existence is an eloquent warning to those who would destroy us. Let them know that the American eagle has not turned chicken.

Indeed, the anti-defense hysteria in this country has produced an entirely new breed of bird. The doves have not been content to merely pick at our defense establishment, exploiting the controversy over Viet Nam. They have recruited a new breed of bird, an amphibious ostrich, who would stick his head under the sea while hostile submarine commanders gaze through their periscopes at the tempting target of the amphibious ostrich's posterior—big, fat, and exposed.

Let me make one thing clear. I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services and must make a personal confession. I must confess that I am an anti-war agitator. But the way that I feel we should agitate against war is to build a defense so superior that it will deter aggression. The way to prevent war is to prepare for it. The way to encourage war is to unilaterally disarm, to ignore the enemy's buildup, and to disparage all those who would equip us to deal with a determined enemy.

The commissioning of the *Spadefish* is a great triumph for the peace movement, a blow against militarism, and a guarantee against war. The courageous men who will man this ship are the most effective peace advocates I can imagine.

Yet, there are many squawks echoing in Washington. The amphibious ostrich becomes infuriated and flaps into an impotent rage with its vestigial wings if anyone dares mention that the Soviet Union has embarked on the largest submarine building program that the world has ever known.

The Russians now have about 375 submarines, all built since World War Two, as compared to our 144, including diesels, most of which are of World War Two vintage. It is estimated that by 1974 the Soviets will add about 70 new submarines to their fleet, while the United States will add only 24.

In the last year alone, the Russians put to sea several new types of nuclear attack submarines and a new-type ballistic missile submarine. We have completed only one new design submarine in a decade.

No fewer than 105 of the Russian submarines are equipped to fire missiles. We have less than half this number.

If you point all this out, the anti-defense ostrich will lay an amphibious egg. But the yolk will be on him—and us—if we don't activate a powerful new anti-submarine warfare program to overtake and surpass the Russian submarine threat.

Skilled ASW men may differ over technical requirements for ASW aircraft carriers, turbo-prop planes, sonar buoys, new and better destroyers, and submarines like the *Spadefish* to fight the underwater threat. But there are no differences on the urgency of the need to perfect our antisubmarine defenses.

Admiral Caldwell has this year testified before the Congress with a request mindful of and deferential to the prevailing Congressional mood. He made a very modest and practical request for a 10% increase in the Navy's ASW budget. He saw this as essential to mount even a minimum response to the new Soviet challenge.

As a Member of Congress, I am more free to speak out than the admiral and other distinguished naval officers. The admiral and his colleagues know what is happening in the Soviet submarine yards. They are deeply troubled by the specter of Russian submarine power. But they must be practical and frugal when they ask the angry taxpayers for money at a time when the anti-war vogue is such that Naval ROTC units are being driven from our universities.

I may be accused of being out of vogue because I don't want to put our Navy into the new miniskirts—or the slave chains the girls are wearing around their waists. But I am less interested in fashion than in fact. I say, "damn the ostriches, full speed ahead" on a realistic ASW program.

Let me explain to you why I have become such an agitator on this ASW question. I see it as the most sincere form of anti-war expression, the only real guarantee for peace. I am a "peace-nik" in this sense because I represent a constituency of citizens who go down to the sea in ships—citizens who are painfully aware of the horrors of war, and are cosmopolitan and sophisticated enough to know that war must be prevented.

It was only a year ago when we became aware that the Soviet Navy in 1968 had reached a submarine strength that our authorities did not believe they could attain until 1975. Moscow has been running seven years ahead of our best estimates, ahead of our computer projections. There are no amphibious ostriches to be found in the Soviet Union!

Moscow's 105 missile submarines represent a great threat not only to our men at sea but to our cities at home. Next year, 1970, will not see us catching up. Indeed, the Russians will move even further ahead in certain naval categories.

We must be concerned not only with existing Soviet submarine strength but with the fantastic production base that has been established. There are also the qualitative improvements. Their submarines are quieter, faster, and better than we imagined.

Fifty-eight per cent of the Soviet Navy is less than 10 years old. This contrasts with our ships which average 18 years of age. All of the Soviet Navy has been built since the end of World War II. We are still using some elderly ships, destroyers as well as submarines, that should be retired forthwith.

The Russians next year will be even further ahead of us in submarine strength. The sad truth is that we are being left behind. There is no excuse for this.

ASW is the essence of defense. It is linked to the safety and protection of our nation with the traditional assignment of defending our ships and shores. We cannot compromise with the anti-defense crowd on ASW. Indeed, the time has come for a counter-attack. Those who would defend our nation cannot go on the defensive.

Russia now has a submarine building yard so vast that it could include more yards than our country even possesses. The Russians can build 20 nuclear submarines a year. This includes 12 of the Polaris type.

In 1966 we had 300 students in naval architecture and marine engineering. The Russians had 7,000. That is the contrast in the emerging technical base.

Admiral Rickover has said that "Numerical superiority, however, does not tell the whole story. Weapons systems, speed, depth, detection devices, quietness of operation, and crew performance all make a significant contribution to the effectiveness of a submarine force. From what we have been able to learn during the past year, the Soviets have attained equality in a number of these characteristics and superiority in some."

Now that Moscow is reaching a point of parity with us, and is moving ahead in submarine power, are they trimming sails? They certainly are not. They are expediting the pace of submarine construction.

Congress has just learned that the Russians now have the world's fastest submarine. Emboldened by their growing power, the Russians are operating farther away from their bases, in larger numbers, and for longer periods of time. New types of submarines and improved mother ships are emerging.

Russian submarines are no longer strangers to our coastal waters. Nor is the Soviet Navy showing timidity. There was nothing timid about the naval movements in Cuban waters and the Gulf of Mexico this summer. Nor are the threats to the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean indicating a meek posture.

Soviet submarine progress has been achieved in days when too many Americans do not want to hear about it. They have hypnotized themselves with some grandiose delusion that if we stop all defense spending our foreign enemies will fall in love with us, while at home, poverty and racial antagonisms will disappear from our cities.

I feel the time has come to take one compelling aspect of our defense and concentrate on it with an appeal to reason. That aspect is ASW.

Let me propose a bold response to a bold threat. When we discovered that the Russians had surpassed us with the first Soviet Sputnik, back in 1957, we embarked on a crash program and have now closed the gap and passed them. Let us do the same with ASW.

We must do more than wish you officers and men of *Spadefish* a perfunctory Godspeed and smooth sailing. We have absolute confidence in your qualities and capabilities. Your ship is the finest ever constructed by our shipbuilding industry. We are proud of our nuclear navy—what it lacks in quantity it more than makes up in quality. Your patriotism, courage, and devotion inspire us all.

Yet we must keep faith not only with you but with the brave men of the first *Spadefish*, which served with such extraordinary heroism against the Japanese in World War II. We can achieve this sacred trust not only by voicing our heartfelt sentiments today but by pledging that what Americans can do on the moon, we can do on the seas and under the seas. We will be second to none.

Agencies were transformed, commands activated, and the public enlisted when we had to meet the Soviet Sputnik challenge in the skies. The same can and *must* be done now for ASW and for our entire naval power.

Let the *Spadefish* serve as the symbol of a new commitment . . . a commitment to a Navy that will not have to beg and beseech for handouts . . . a Navy whose research and development receive top priority . . . a Navy that will not permit the trident to be wrested from our grasp.

SEAPOWER REQUIREMENTS FOR A BALANCED MERCHANT MARINE

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on September 1 the Federal Maritime Commission will lose its very able and knowledgeable Chairman, Adm. John Harllee. His many years of experience in the maritime field have given him a background which enables him to speak with authority on our merchant marine and its needs. Therefore, I consider it a privilege to bring to your attention his remarks to the executive committee of the Navy League last month on this subject.

Since the economy of our country is closely related to our merchant marine, I know his views will be of great interest to every Member. They follow:

REMARKS BY REAR ADM. JOHN HARLLEE

Ever since I entered the Naval Academy 39 years ago, I have been a great admirer of the Navy League and its patriotic fight for maintaining our national strength at sea. My life since that time has been devoted to the seas, first in the Navy and then at the Federal Maritime Commission, with a year and a half in the political and business worlds in between. With this background it is not a cliché for me to say that it is a special honor and pleasure for me to appear before the leaders of the Navy League today.

Although I have attended the Naval War College, am familiar with the doctrine of Mahan and am a latter day disciple of Rear Admiral George H. Miller, I am sure that it is not necessary for me to impress upon this group the importance of oceanic power in all of its aspects. I know we all agree without further discussion that our nation cannot have adequate strength for peace and prosperity or for anything else we stand for without primacy on the seas. Though the public does not seem to fully comprehend its import we all recognize also the truth of Admiral Miller's statement before the Sea Power Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, "history records that the nations which build the ships carried the cargo and collected the revenues have generally been powerful and well-off in an economic sense."

There is no question whatsoever that it is essential that we do a great deal more about the Navy, oceanography, our fishing fleet, our sea power infrastructure ashore and oceanic education. Nevertheless, I believe that the element of our oceanic strength which needs the most consideration and support of all is the merchant marine. That is why I believe that President James M. Hannan was so wise in making the subject of his first President's Message "The Maritime Industry—Mainstay of American Prosperity." The quote he used from Theodore Roosevelt as the lead for his message could not have been more appropriate:

"To the spread of our trade in peace and the defense of our flag a great and prosperous merchant marine is indispensable."

The purpose of my talk today will be to suggest what the Navy League can do to strengthen the American merchant marine.

Nor will I dwell on how critical the situation is, for you are familiar with what has happened. However, I will briefly recapitulate that the American flag merchant marine is only carrying about 6 percent of our cargo by tonnage and only about 28 percent by value; that roughly 80 percent of our ships are obsolescent; that the once two thousand ships in our reserve fleet have dwindled to a few dozen ships with any real usefulness; and that for many years our maritime industry has been driven by what might be called internecine strife and seriously weakened by public apathy. I might say at this point that being a member of the Navy League Resolutions Committee afforded me a genuine sense of pride and I believe that the program formulated by the Committee if vigorously implemented will go a long way to capitalize on our opportunity at sea and solve our maritime problems.

I will go into a little detail on one danger. I know that you have heard a great deal about the Russian threat on the seas. You know the serious problems our Sixth Fleet has in the Mediterranean. You were undoubtedly startled at the presence of Soviet warships off the coast of Florida during the Apollo 11 shot and their visit to Cuba, the scene of President Kennedy's great seapower triumph at the time of the missile confrontation. What our public must learn, however, is the ominous threat developing in the form of the Soviet merchant marine. I subscribe to President Hannan's statement that

"We are beginning to grasp the fact that the Russian Merchant Marine is spearheading the Soviet drive for world supremacy," but unfortunately we are only beginning to grasp it.

Today the United States is engaged in a 65 billion dollar export-import commerce and it is obvious why the Soviet Union wants "in" on world trade and why they are not being a bit bashful about it.

The Russian merchant marine is very aggressive. When ships carrying supplies to Viet Nam were returning empty to Europe, the Russians penetrated the overproduced Australian wool market. By cutting freight rates 15 to 25% they diverted wool cargoes into the holds of their vessels to the detriment of the carriers which regularly served the Australian-European run.

The Soviets are penetrating the trade between Japan and the Western world. They have carried cargoes on commercial runs between Japan and Canada.

On July 7, 1969, a high ranking Russian government delegation called at my office on an unofficial "friendly" mission.

These friendly Russians sang a siren's song for me and my staff. They said that they would seek no advantage, that there would be mutual benefit. They pointed out how unfortuntae it is that the trade between our two great countries has not developed. They said that the purpose of this visit was to have a "pleasurable exchange of opinion".

All of this friendly chitchat by this illustrious Soviet delegation bore one single central theme: The Russian merchant marine wants in on our 65 billion dollar export-import commerce and wants to share in its profitability.

I told the Soviet delegation that what they proposed was not in my purview but must be decided by the President and the Congress with the most careful consideration for our national interest. I mention this visit to you only to highlight the dynamic maritime determination and aggressiveness of the Russians.

Having thus set the stage, I would like to outline a few bright spots in the picture before delineating a program. The most optimistic note of all is the lead the American steamship lines have taken in containerization. This is a veritable revolution which reduces transportation costs on the order of 30 to 50 percent. A number of American flag lines can lay legitimate claim to being pioneers in this effort but the earliest large scale successful operation was performed by Sea-Land in the Puerto Rican trade. Sea-Land and its containers have now spread to almost all our principal trade routes. Sea-Land has amazed shipping circles by making a profit without operating or construction subsidy. Matson, Seatrain, American Export-Isbrandtsen, United States Lines, Grace, Moore-McCormack, and others have been quick to follow suit with containers. You may not believe it when I tell you that very highly placed persons in Japan actually expressed to me a fear of Sea-Land as a competitor in the Pacific trade routes. In the trade from the United Kingdom to the United States, Container Marine Lines, a subsidiary of American Export-Isbrandtsen Lines, has been a ferocious competitor.

The American merchant marine under the auspices of the U.S. Government, built and operated the first and until recently the only nuclear powered merchant ship, although unfortunately, this lead has not been followed up despite Admiral "Dutch" Will's commendable crusade for nuclear propulsion. We must remember that the Bible says, "Where there is no vision the people perish."

Another cheerful note is the matter of the action and the talk of men like Joseph Kahn, Chairman of Seatrain, who predicts that by 1971 American flagships will be carrying fifty percent of our cargo. His company has purchased the old Brooklyn Naval Shipyard and plans to build big modern ships particularly with an eye to carriage of some of the fifty billion barrels of oil off the northern coast of Alaska. Humble Oil and Atlantic Richfield will operate Kahn and Pak's S. S. Manhattan this summer in a fascinating experiment which will test the feasibility of the Northwest Passage for giant tankers.

Maritime labor is destined to make a major contribution to the revitalization of the U.S. Maritime industry. Experts in the shipping field have claimed that labor has been a critical factor in inhibiting the required maritime progress. However, the June 15, 1969 settlement of major maritime labor disputes after a very short strike affords a new note of encouragement on the labor front. The great American maritime unions, the National Maritime Union and the Seafarers International Union and their associated organizations have consistently rendered substantial support to our merchant marine by convincing many members of Congress and segments of the public as to its importance.

Both Paul Hall and Joe Curran have been foremost in presenting progressive and detailed well considered maritime programs to the Congress and to the public. I was glad to see that both had representatives on the oceanic doctrine panel at our last annual convention. This impressive evidence of The Navy League serving as a catalyst to encourage cooperation among the divisive elements of our maritime community is most gratifying. Incidentally, on this subject General Duchein's speech "The Mess in the Merchant Marine" given to the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, remains a masterpiece.

Finally, there is reason to believe that President Nixon and his Administration will focus attention on our maritime needs. President Johnson must be credited with paving the way with the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 and the Sea Grant College Program. The Nixon Administration will find everready allies in Senator Magnuson and his Commerce Committee and Congressman Garmatz and his House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and, of course, the Navy League can never forget that great fighter for sea power, Mendel Rivers. Chairman Rivers' Sea Power Subcommittee promises to provide substantial support to the maritime program, in addition to his backing of the largest naval ship construction program in our history.

The climate in the Congress for favorable action to improve our maritime posture is more favorable than for many years. I personally know that there is tremendous potential bipartisan support for reasserting our heritage on the seas. For example, both the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the House Appropriations Committee wanted to increase more than ten fold the ship construction subsidy recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Congressman Maillard, a Rear Admiral in the Naval Reserve and the ranking minority member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, can be counted on for strong and understanding support of all forms of sea power.

President Nixon has assigned a top level group of his advisors to work out a maritime program. That group is headed by the Undersecretary of Commerce, Rocco Siciliano, the Maritime Administrator, Andrew E. Gibson, and Robert Carl, Special Assistant to the Undersecretary of the Navy. Fortunately, these men have strong maritime backgrounds. They have reported to the Senate Appropriations Committee that their recommendations will be available about the end of September.

A week ago the President announced that he will appoint Helen Delich Bentley as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission. She is Maritime Editor of the Baltimore Sun and has written for Navy magazine. She has a reputation as a fighter for the American merchant marine.

Although I have been in touch with Mr. Gibson and other members of the National Administration on certain maritime problems, it would not be appropriate for me to forecast exactly what this group will recommend. Nevertheless I believe that the program will be a well considered one and will, after executed, represent a plus for our merchant marine. However, the question still remains to be seen as to whether the tremendous effort necessary to regain a preeminent position on the oceans will be made and everything depends upon the answer to this question. As commendable as these efforts will be, I am convinced that we of the Navy League must mount an ever-increasing campaign to insure that the program will be big enough.

President Kennedy believed that we should expend a large part of our resources on the exploration of space in the interest of all mankind, and the entire world thrilled with the success of these efforts when naval aviator Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldren landed on the moon. The Senate has just demonstrated that it is willing to expend ¾ billions of dollars on the ABM system if the defense of our nation requires it. A week ago President Nixon also demonstrated that if human needs require it for the overall good of our country, he was willing to recommend the spending of as much as four billion dollars in the form of relief and welfare. This makes me think that this Administration can be convinced that it should approve of the relatively small investment in the maritime industry essential to the security and prosperity of the United States. Furthermore, this investment, unlike the ones in the space race and in defense—necessary as they are—will bring major returns in balance of payments, jobs, and trade advantages. For example, if our merchant marine carried the 30 percent of the cargo which is President Nixon's goal, most of our balance of payments deficit would be eliminated. The expansion of our world trade from 34 billion dollars to 65 billion dollars over the past 8 years provides great economic opportunities which can be fully realized only with our own merchant ships.

I am convinced that the Resolutions formulated at the last annual convention of the League provide the necessary outline for a program of action on our part which would accomplish what President Hannan desires.

Five of the resolutions in our 1969 Declaration of Objectives and Resolutions pertain to our maritime program. The *first* is "*National Oceanic Policy*." Unquestionably this is our maritime matrix. We must press hard to gain a policy pronouncement by the President of the United States. In this regard President Nixon's letter to Mr. Hannan is reassuring, but this is not enough. We should continue every effort to encourage this vital action. The closest pronouncements we have to a maritime policy are the preambles to the shipping statutes, the last of which was written in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The policy was good then, but it is inadequate to meet the overwhelming needs of the present day, both from an economic viewpoint and from that of national defense, particularly in view of the phenomenal growth of Soviet competition.

Our *second* Resolution is "*National Oceanic Strategy*". From the doctrine that is now developing, it is evident that we are moving to a maritime strategy as a nation. What I am referring to is both the instrument of economic purpose and the provision for defense. Our strategy must encompass the total resources of the country on the oceans to give us flexibility a Commander-in Chief requires. I envisage that the National Security Council, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Commerce (which contains the Maritime Administration) will be brought closer together in the planning and implementation of this national oceanic strategy.

In order to accelerate the implementation of an oceanic strategy as called for by this Resolution I suggest strictly individually and personally a separate maritime department or agency which will give first consideration to maritime matters. The head of this organization would have access to the President, preferably as a cabinet member. As you know, a number of bills to this effect have been introduced in Congress. Former National Navy League President Frank Gard Jameson made an excellent case for this in his comments on the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, delivered to the Desk and Derrick Club of Los Angeles on April 15, 1969.

As you know, the President has appointed an Advisory Council on Executive Reorganization to consider what to do about the proliferation of some 150 departments and agencies in the Federal Government. It is essential that Navy League make its views known to this committee. Its Chairman is Roy L. Ash, President of Litton Industries and one of the members is a former Secretary of the Navy, John B. Connally of Texas.

The *third* of our Resolutions is the one on the "*Long Range Ship Construction Program.*" This program is in motion. Both the Secretary of the Navy and the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee have called for the largest naval ship construction programs in the nation's history and the League has pledged its fullest support for the ship construction program.

I can't emphasize too much that the heart of our whole maritime problem is the complete inadequacy of ships both in being and being built. I have already discussed the upcoming maritime program, the most important feature of which should be an increase in ship construction. In a few years we will have less than 300 really serviceable ships, against the 1400 modern ones the Soviet Union has now. The Russian merchant marine is backed by a building program of a million tons a year. We are building only about 21 to 24 ships a year for our merchant marine (about a third of which are subsidized) whereas we should be building, as General Duchein has stated, a hundred merchant ships a year for the next decade.

I must say I am impressed with the progressiveness of the American shipbuilders. They are moving forward aggressively with determination to meet the market. As Mr. Jack Gilbride, President of Todd Shipyards pointed out in his oceanic doctrine panel presentation:

"What is needed at the present time is a clear simple declaration of national intent. Once our Federal Government says that it intends to recapture its power at sea—and translates this *policy* into a wise and sensible long range, stable shipbuilding program, the American yards will be able to respond effectively and build the ships this nation needs."

The *fourth* of our Resolutions is *Oceanic Education*. Obviously, the success of our entire long range maritime program rests on oceanic education, at all levels from grade school through college. Education must provide the firm foundation in the quest for an American maritime renaissance.

Some of you may recall that I proposed the establishment of an L. Mendel Rivers Center of Maritime Studies in South Carolina as one method of broadening oceanic education. I hope that other members of the Navy League will work toward the establishment of similar institutes throughout the country.

All of us in the maritime community have watched developments at *Webb Institute Center of Maritime Studies* on Long Island, headed by Rear Admiral Bill Brockett, and are pleased that the studies produced there are beginning to gain national attention.

The *fifth* and final of our Resolutions is *National Oceanic Research*. We can and must build the finest ships in the world, the swiftest and most modern our technology can produce—to do so will require a resolute maritime research and development program incomparably greater than our present program. True, the Maritime Administration's Research and Development budget has been doubled this year. This is a healthy trend. The budget soared from $7 million to $15 million. That sounds pretty impressive, but compare this to the $25 billion spent on space research, or the billions ultimately to be spent on the proposed ABM System. This shows what a tiny portion of our research effort has been directed towards the oceans and the magnitude of efforts elsewhere.

The new Maritime Administrator recently held a "Conference on Maritime Research and Development" at Woods Hole. He brought together a hundred leaders of the maritime to lay out the program the maritime industry requires in the next 10 years to develop the superior modern merchant fleet our nation needs. This conference was of unusual length—three weeks—and augurs well for the future.

In closing let me say that I sincerely believe there are new and brighter days ahead for the Navy and for the American merchant marine.

All in all, I am certain that the concentration of effort now being brought to bear on our seapower programs will give us a balanced seapower program and will give the U.S. maritime industry the encouragement it needs to steam ahead.

The oceans of the worlds beckon us. We must supply the necessary courage, the wisdom and the vision.

I am certain that the Navy League under your leadership will do its full share and that we just will not wind-up with too-little, too-late on the high seas!

JOHN W. CARPENTER

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when I first entered public life, one of the first men I got to know was the late John Carpenter of Dallas, Tex. It is indeed a rare privilege for a young man entering public life to meet such a man as was John Carpenter. I do not believe that many men exist today who one could liken to John Carpenter. He was a great American, a family man and devoted to doing anything which he felt would better the lot of his fellow man.

It is indeed fitting that Dallas elected to name their freeway after this truly wonderful man and I wish to include an article by Mr. Sam Acheson which appeared in the Dallas Morning News for September 1 in the RECORD:

FREEWAY NAMED FOR JOHN CARPENTER

(By Sam Acheson)

John W. Carpenter, the noted Dallas leader for whom Carpenter Freeway was named, died 10 years ago in his 78th year. He was the first native Texan to head the vast $1.5-billion Texas utility empire set up by J. F. Strickland and associates.

As a utility executive, Carpenter was highly successful. In this he followed ably in the footsteps of his predecessors—Strickland himself, W. B. Head and C. E. Calder, to mention only those who held the top command in turn before him.

But the impact of Carpenter's life extended far beyond the three electric power companies. He proved to be one of those business and industrial leaders whose aims and ambitions for their home communities are not bounded by purely local horizons.

Carpenter was born Aug. 31, 1881, on a Navarro County cotton farm, the third of 10 children born to John Wirt and Ellen Carpenter. His training beyond local schools included a term at Denton's State Normal (now North Texas State University), a course in a Fort Worth business college and correspondence school instruction.

At 19, Carpenter got his first job in town digging holes for light poles for the Corsicana Gas and Electric Company. The company was owned by Frank N. Drane, a leading businessman and investor of Corsicana, who soon became impressed with Carpenter's character and abilities.

Within five years the young man advanced to general superintendent, then applied for an on-the-job training program offered by the General Electric Company at Schenectady.

"Carpenter is one of the best men I've ever had work for me." Drane wrote in support of Carpenter's applicati)n. "He is faithful as a dog, industrious as sunshine and almost as constant as gravity—always even tempered, thoughtful and watchful (of others' interests)."

In 1907 Carpenter returned to Texas to serve as president of the Corsicana Gas and Electric Co., as well as two other Drane properties, the Corsicana Street Railway and the Athens Power & Light Co.

In 1913 Carpenter was married to Miss Flossie Belle Gardner, member of a prominent East Texas family at Palestine.

J. F. Strickland called Carpenter to Dallas in 1918 to become vice-president and general manager of the Dallas Power & Light Co. The next year he transferred to the same post with Texas Power & Light.

Carpenter became president of TP&L in 1927 and, following the death of W. B. Head in 1937, the chief figure in management of the three utility firms, including the Texas Electric Service Company serving Fort Worth and West Texas.

Typical of Carpenter's broad outlook was his espousal in 1930 of the Trinity Improvement Association, the first instance of major cooperataion between the former rivals of Dallas and Fort Worth.

He also had a key part in the creation of the Big Bend National Park. In this same period he was a leader in securing the establishment of Texas Tech at Lubbock. He backed other important developments over the state, including the establishment of the Lone Star Steel Co. at Daingerfield.

Carpenter also worked the advancement of Baylor, Southern Methodist and the University of Dallas. He gave 160 acres to the magnificent campus of the latter at Irving overlooking the City of Dallas. Texas Tech and SMU conferred honorary degrees upon Carpenter and the University of Dallas named its science building, Carpenter Hall, for him.

Carpenter had a wide range of interests in Dallas' civic and cultural affairs extending from support of the Boy Scouts of America to the Dallas Grand Opera Association. He served as a Southwestern chairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. He was a life-long member of the Presbyterian Church.

In the early 1950s at the peak of the long and bitter squabble between Dallas and Fort Worth over a midway airport, Carpenter was elected president of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce. He electrified that body by calling for an end to the airport fight with the two cities to get together to build a joint air terminal of the first magnitude.

"It does not seem reasonable to me," said Carpenter, "that two cities only 30 miles apart with a combined population of a million should continue to fight each other."

He predicted that Dallas' Love Field would become inadequate within five years and that the population of Dallas-Fort Worth would reach 2,000,000 by 1971.

Although work on the present regional airport to serve Dallas, Fort Worth and other neighboring communities was not begun before his death, it promises to be testimony in large part to the broad vision and constructive counsel of John W. Carpenter.

Earlier in his business career, Carpenter had organized the Texas Security Mutual Insurance Co. It became, in turn, the Gulf States Life Insurance Co., then the present Southland Insurance Company, of which he was board chairman at the time of his death.

Carpenter died at his Dallas County ranch of Las Colinas on June 16, 1959. He was survived by his wife and two children, Ben H. Carpenter, and a daughter, Mrs. Dan Williams, both of Dallas. Another son, John W. Carpenter, Jr. had lost his life in a traffic accident while a student at Austin during the 1930s.

THE URBAN LEAGUE'S NEW THRUST TOWARD ECONOMIC SECURITY AND AN OPEN SOCIETY

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, in a brilliant speech before the National Urban League during its annual conference in Washington, D.C., on July 28, 1969, Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive secretary, outlined the league's goals and commitments in a new thrust toward the achievement of economic security for the millions of the Nation's poor.

Comparing the unprecedented achievement of the moon landing, made possible by a demonstration of technical and physical capability plus the expenditure of vast sums of public money, with the apparent withdrawal of the present administration from the urban-racial problems of the Nation, Mr. Young called for the same national commitment to solve the abundant and acute problems and to close the gap between promise and performance.

The National Urban League's economic security program is a reasonable, feasible way of meeting some long-existing problems and deserves the fullest consideration by those of us who will chart America's path in the years ahead.

Text of the speech follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS OF WHITNEY M. YOUNG, JR.

Last week two men stepped out of their space capsule and walked on the moon. The world thrilled to their deed. Pride swelled the hearts of Americans as our flag was planted on the craterpocked moonscape.

It was a moment of supreme triumph, a moment that demonstrated the wonders of modern technology.

But above all, it was a moment that demonstrated to all mankind what is possible when America places its resources behind a national commitment to achieve a specific goal.

For it was only in 1961—8 short years ago—that President John F. Kennedy said: "the nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and safely returning him to earth."

The commitment was made, and the nation rallied behind it. Some $35-billion was spent as America prepared for an achievement unprecedented in the history of mankind.

Through the miracle of technology the people of the world watched the moon landing.

Behind the ghetto streetscapes; in peeling, rundown old tenements; on television sets purchased at outrageous installment interest rates—they watched.

In humble shacks in the rural backwaters of Hancock County, Georgia, or the Mississippi Delta country—they watched.

In souless, sterile high-rise public housing projects—they watched.

Hungry children, unemployed men, welfare mothers—all watched as history unfolded before their eyes.

Two Americans walked on the moon, and important as this may be in our scientific advancement, its immediate contribution to the betterment of mankind escaped those who suffer. It did not feed one hungry child in Mound Bayou; it did not employ one man in the slums of Chicago; it did not free one mother from the strictures of a family-destroying welfare system in Watts.

For the nearly thirty million poor Americans—white and black—the moon walk has no effect except, perhaps, to taunt a child with dreams of accomplishment the system places beyond his reach, or to flaunt affluence and power in the face of the already disillusioned poor, trapped in the prison of poverty and despair.

How truly different for all of us it would have been if this nation had followed the urgings of the National Urban League in 1963, and had committed itself to the creation of a national society in which poverty would have been eliminated and all people would have enjoyed decent homes, decent schools, and meaningful work at decent wages.

It does not slight the brave men who journeyed where man has never journeyed before to say that this goal is more relevant. It does not slight the brilliance of American technology to say that it would have been better directed toward improving life here on earth. And it does not slight the holders of power in America to say that once again that they have proven their ability to achieve what they set their minds to.

But for a young nation, born to provide freedom and a heaven for the tired and the poor, one can justifiably question this current value system and order of priority. It is high time that a new national commitment and new priorities were set, for without these, we will have won the moon while losing the peace, the security, the democratic promise of America.

In his inaugural address, President Nixon said: "Those who have been left out, we will try to bring in; those left behind we will help to catch up."

He declared that "No man can be fully free while his neighbor is not. To go forward at all, is to go forward together."

But in the words of Thoreau, "The language of friendship is not words—but meanings."

And we wait—impatiently—for the Administration to redeem its solemn pledge, and to move this country forward together.

It looks like a long wait.

Instead of the massive national commitment that is needed, evidence is mounting that indicates massive national withdrawal from the urban-racial problems that should be at the top of the list of priorities. We seem to be moving backwards to an age of indifference and repression.

The administration has encouraged diehard segregationists by loosening guidelines that would have insured southern desegregation of schools this fall. "More time", they ask. How much time do law-breaking districts need for an administration that campaigned for law and order? These districts have already had 15 years! And now the Administration is prepared to offer yet still more time.

The Justice Department tried to kill extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act by offering a substitute that would have spread already limited resources and weakened enforcement.

The government is still handing out fat contracts to some businesses that illegally discriminate against black workers.

Is *this* moving forward together?

The Administration has allowed rigid conservatives to veto good appointments. Dr. John Knowles lost the top health post because of his interest in health insurance for the poor. And when Clifford Alexander fought too hard against employers who illegally discriminate, he was forced to resign.

The poverty program has been "reorganized" and has lapsed into an awful silence that indicates it is going to a quiet death at the very moment when we need it most.

Thousands of youngsters in the Job Corps have seen their hopes crumble and promises made to them broken through the callous penny-pinching policies that closed Job Corps Camps.

Instead of facing the problem of crime by upgrading police forces and eliminating injustices that breed crime, the Administration has proposed "preventive detention" measures that would allow judges to pervert civil liberties by locking up an accused person solely on the suspicion that he *might* commit a crime in the future.

Is *this* the way to move forward together? Or is it a step backward to the time when racial concentration camps were established for Japanese-Americans during World War Two?

The Administration has done nothing to counter—in fact, it encourages the whole mood of backlash leading to elections of unqualified candidates who campaign under the tattered banner of "law and order" with its subtle appeals to racism.

The hate and suspicion such candidates breed provide no basis for "moving forward together."

A war-strained economy has become inflationary, and the burden of controlling it has fallen on those least able to pay. The economy has been slowed down, jobs made scarcer, housing restricted by tight money.

And all the while, the monster of the war machine is fed its billions.

We can afford bombs—but not housing.

We can afford to subsidize huge farm corporations, but not the welfare poor.

We in the Urban League asked for a Domestic Marshall Plan; instead, we are offered a Domestic anti-missile plan.

The war is costing more than $2-billion per month. This means the whole war on poverty costs as much as one month's fighting in Vietnam. All housing programs—including the still-born Model Cities program—cost the same as about a month of the war. The war cost for ten weeks equals what was spent on all educational programs last year. The money spent this year on the food stamp program and school lunches amounts to the cost of a week of war, and thousands still go hungry because, we are told, money is unavailable.

Is *this* any way to go forward together?

By its own spending actions the government makes a mockery of its claim that it can't afford vital and long overdue social programs. If war-inspired inflation is a problem, let's have wage and price controls such as all countries have when they are at war. Let's have meaningful tax reforms that closes the loop-holes available to the rich, instead of a surtax that affects all, or intimidating measures directed at foundations, further limiting money available for humane purposes. But let's not ask the poor, who have waited so long and so patiently, to wait still further—for the war's end, or for completion of costly and questionable military hardware purchases before they get their fair share of America.

Black Americans still want to catch up and go forward; but we also want assurances that the Administration will honor our just claims, and not refer them to Senator Thurmond's tender mercies.

The President—it seems—has two choices. He can continue policies that say to black people "I owe you nothing." Or he can say "I will prove by my future actions that you have misjudged me."

To choose the latter means abandoning a a strategy that actually escalates racial tension and conflict. History is a harsh judge, and it will judge harshly those who choose political expedience over moral leadership in a nation torn by confusion and doubt.

Black people, Mexican-Americans, Puerto-Ricans, the white poor, idealistic and dedicated students—these can no longer be put off by vague phrases and general statements that aren't backed up by swift action. As John F. Kennedy once said, "responsibility is not discharged by simply the announcement of virtuous ends."

The gap between promise and performance has led to anger and frustration, and is responsible for some direct action methods in recent months that many Americans blindly condemn. These solid, middle-class citizens become outraged at sit-ins, confrontations, and disruptions of public meetings.

Some of these methods, while not a part of the Urban League program, cannot be separated from the real outrages that cause them. Challenges to the convenience of some people cannot be equated against the real inequities that lead to demonstrations.

For what is the loss of convenience compared with the lives that are lost and the young people destroyed by the workings of institutions that do violence to the hopes, dreams, and very futures of poor people? Children literally starve in some southern counties; children are schooled for failure in big cities; whole families are doomed to poverty and dependency by callous welfare regulations and people still have the gall to complain about being "inconvenienced."

And we never cease to hear the sweet voices of reason condemn this justified anger of the dispossessed. Now we are told that the students and the poor are encouraging backlash. Once again, the victim is condemned for crying out in pain. Once again, the bleeding man is condemned for his wounds.

Well, Dr. Martin Luther King heard that, too; and Ed Pratt heard it. He was told that a march on Selma would encourage backlash, that boycotting segregated buses in Montgomery would encourage the Klan.

When we worked to organize the 1963 March on Washington, we were told that we would encourage backlashers. In those all-too-far-off days when whites and blacks joined arms and sang "We shall Overcome", we were warned that the majority of Americans would be provoked.

The ghetto poor today know and understand what is happening. They may have been denied formal educations, but they have learned in the schools of the streets, and in the classrooms of poverty, just how this society is organized and run. They know that federal subsidies to private corporations and the rich run to over $44-billion, while subsidies to the poor, who need it most, are less than a quarter of that.

They know that power has been used to defeat the powerless—and they now demand a share of the power in our society. They've been told they are poor because their family structure is wrong, their IQ's inferior, their skills non-existent. But they are aware of the divorce and abortion rates of the white middle-class; they know rigged IQ tests are not relevant—and they are painfully aware that discrimination keeps them from acquiring skills.

They have dealt with too many mediocre bureaucrats to be awed by the supposed superiority of white people in white collars. They have worked in too many private homes—and seen the cheating and dishonesty that characterize their supposedly moral superiors.

Black people, and other minorities who suffer poverty in disproportionate numbers, know that the root causes of this poverty lie not within themselves, but within the institutions of society that seek not justice, but perpetuation of their own power.

The poor will submit no longer. They will accept a fate decreed by frightened men no longer.

For black people pride has been substituted for fear, determination for apathy, and dignity for subservience. We now know that freedom is not for free—or cannot be bought in bargain basements. America must face up to its responsibility or be exposed in the annals of history for what it really is.

The Urban League's role in these troubled times is to stand by our society's forgotten victims, and to help create the community structures and organizations which will bring power to the powerless and responsibility to those now being asked to be responsible. This requires that all citizens must have a stake in society and must be given authority with which to exercise that responsibility.

And so the Urban League has set as its ultimate goal the achievement of equal results for black citizens and other minorities. When among black people as a group the same proportion of people succeed and fail as in other groups, equality will become a reality.

Our traditional programs, though now directed toward institutional change, have been retained—and even expanded. Our commitment to legal, non-violent strategies remains unchanged, our belief in interracial cooperation redoubled—in principle and in practice. But the main thrust of our activities must be to sink roots deep in the ghetto—and to work with its citizens to change the systems that have perpetuated the inequities.

We have found that the best use of our limited resources lies in finding out what the community itself wants and needs, and then assisting it to change the institutions that have the power to deliver those services.

So we've organized tenants groups, and helped the tenants of housing projects to confront housing authorities and win changes in the regulations governing them.

In city after city Leagues are "new-thrusting" in voter registration drives that will bring power by the ballot—not destruction by the bullet.

We have helped to organize black businessmen to secure a base from which they can serve the entire urban community and take their rightful place in the local business establishments, changing those institutions by their very presence.

We have challenged the educational establishment and placed black people in positions of influence. Our street academies are well-known. They have taken young people whom the schools said could not be educated, young people who had been claimed by the life of the streets, and given them basic and prep school educations. Now street academy graduates are in Harvard, Princeton, and in other top colleges all over the country.

But we don't seek to create a parallel school system. The true purpose of the street academies is to teach the mind-destroying institutions our successful concepts so that the public schools themselves can be relevant to ghetto youngsters.

We have gone into the rural ghettos of Georgia and Alabama, working with the poorest of America's poor. Our new office in Sparta, Georgia, in the midst of Hancock County, where per capita income is a mere $790, is concrete evidence of our determination to make Hancock County into a showcase of rural development.

We have gone into the colleges and recruited bright, energetic, committed, black student leaders to work with the Urban League during the summer. Sixty of these dedicated young people are here today.

The end of the summer will not be the end of their role in the Urban League; it will be the beginning of a new relationship in which they will have an important involvement in their local Urban Leagues and with the black ghetto. They constitute a leadership cadre of great importance to our movement and to the nation.

The Urban League is also assisting the federation of street gangs—Youth Organizations United—channeling their justified anger to constructive paths.

For we believe in the talents and abilities of these young men and women. We know that they can compete on equal terms with any other group of young people in the country. And we believe they have a unique capability to reach out to their brothers and sisters in the ghetto and help to change the system that oppresses them.

Their energies are wasted when used just in rapping other blacks. Their potential for change is wasted when they accept the paternalistic racism of a university that agrees to even the most frivolous and outrageous of demands. These are hollow condescending victories—symbolic, but without substance.

We want to recruit black youth who will realistically challenge the system. We hope they will see equality not as separatism but as the achievement of equal results in open competition. We want them to see that building Ghetto Power means building unity among black people, while at the same time recognizing the diversity of healthy society needs.

The Urban League's New Thrust is catalyst, organizer, behind-the-scenes enabler. It won't capture the headlines and get the same attention as shouting "hate whitey" slogans, or denouncing black youth before white audiences. But ours is an essential role. Of necessity it is a role that often places us out of the spotlight. Our job is to aid and support our brothers. Without each other we will not succeed.

And black people know this. Other minorities know it. Poor people know it.

In the past 12 months 600,000 people came to Urban League offices around the country. They came for jobs and we placed 60,000 in new jobs and upgraded positions last year. They came for training—and we placed more than 15,000 in on-the-job training positions.

They came for help with welfare authorities, landlords, storekeepers; they came to get assistance in dealing with the whole apparatus of institutions that dominate their lives. And they got that help—and more.

We are a grass-roots community organization primarily serving the poor. Four out of five people who applied to us for training positions last year were living in poverty; one out of five was on welfare. They got jobs paying more than $2.50 an hour—jobs with a future.

When you figure the new wages earned by people placed in jobs by the Urban League, the total comes to $400-million. That money that goes directly to the black community.

That's real green power.

And out of this conference will come a new National Urban League Housing Foundation—a plan for decent low-cost housing, controlled and operated by the community itself.

And out of this conference also will come a plan for ending poverty in America.

We propose an economic security program that will erase poverty from our land and bring new resources and dignity to millions of low and middle income families. The core of our plan is a step-by-step attack on the economic injustices that keep different groups of people poor.

Our economic security program includes:

Expanding social security coverage—and raising social security benefits above the poverty line. By so doing five and a half million elderly people can escape from the prison of poverty.

Expanding the minimum wage and unemployment benefits to end the poverty of the working poor. Three out of four poor people belong to families in which the head of the family worked all or part of the time. There is no justification for people to have to work long and hard, only to bring home paychecks that are below the official poverty line.

A family Allowance Program through which every child in America would get a check for $40 per month—*as a matter of right*. These payments would be taxable, so that middle and upper-income families would be paying much of the allowance back in taxes. Such a family allowance program would help end the poverty that curses the childhood of fifteen million American children.

More than sixty countries have some form of family allowance programs. Experience has shown that such payments do not encourage people to have more children . . . and do result in families spending more for medical care and the necessities of life for their kids.

Guaranteed jobs for all who are able to work. This society has neglected its public services. Schools, hospitals, parks, and other basic public services are starved for adequate funds and manpower. A new effort must be made to improve these services through the creation of five million jobs, jobs that are needed, jobs with a future, jobs that pay decent salaries, jobs that will employ unskilled men and women and provide them with the dignity and skills that meaningful work can give a person.

For those who have not been covered by other elements of this economic security program, we propose a negative income tax form of guaranteed income.

Three out of four poor people are not covered by the welfare system—which is inadequate in any case. Low and moderate income families—both black and white—are getting no assistance whatsoever.

The Urban League believes that its Economic Security Program is a reasonable, feasible way of bringing about a more equal society, a society in which people are not divided by fights along racial lines for the crumbs from the table of an affluent society.

We will also place before the Labor Dept. a request that our OJT program be expanded to include those Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps trainees dropped with the closing of the Job Corps Camps.

Three out of ten poor people are black. But seven out of ten are white. Our program will end poverty for *all*.

And through family allowances, millions of moderate-income white families will be better able to feed and house and clothe their children, too. Their frustrations and bitterness at a society that denies them economic security is channeled into antagonism toward black people, whose movement for justice is more vocal and visible.

But when they support second-rate politicians whose only rallying cry is the subtle racism of "law and order" appeals; when they oppose good black or liberal candidates for mayor; or when they oppose school bond issues, they are also harming themselves.

Backlash is a strange phenomenon. In the struggle to keep the black man down, many white people are damaging their own interests and their own kids. When they fight integrated schools and housing they can only help to create cities that wallow in fear and misery.

These people need help. It's not enough to sneer and say they are bigots. Bridges have to be built to those elements of white society who seek refuge in self-destructive racism.

Our economic security program will go a long way toward constructing the foundations of those bridges. But the basic work must be done through a national effort to educate the public to the evils and dangers of the racism that threatens to destroy us.

To continue on the path of repression is to set up a cycle of protest and increased repression that can only fan the flames of anger and eventually lead to the kind of police state that will enslave all Americans, black people and backlashers alike.

But the burden of the national effort to cure racism must be shouldered by the enlightened white community. It is not for the victims of racism to lead the total society away from racism. The problem lies not with the Negro community's pathology, but with the white, and it is white society that will have to develop the leadership and the moral stamina to cure the cancer that's eating away at its democratic ideals.

It will have to do this, too, if it wants to retain the respect of its young people, who see through the hypocrisy that dominates a society that so freely proclaims high ideals while allowing slums to fester and children to starve.

More than half of young people recently surveyed by Fortune Magazine, students and non-students alike, agreed strongly or partially with the following statement:

"American society is characterized by injustice—insensitivity—lack of candor and inhumanity."

What a judgment on the society their elders created.

Five years ago we were proudly told of the high idealism of the younger generation. They were flocking to join VISTA and the Peace Corps. Today, they are challenging their school administrators and the upholders of the status quo.

What happened? Their idealism is still strong, but their belief in their ability to change this society, to end racism, to make the system humane and responsive to human needs, has been shattered.

A new crusade to end racism can harness the energies of this, the brightest and most idealistic generation of young people in our history.

And a national commitment to build an Open Society can harness the energies of all Americans—young and old—rich and poor—black and white—into a grand coalition to reunite our country under the banner of justice and progress.

The 1960's was the decade of space exploration, and we saw the frontiers of space crumble before man's will to search the heavens. The 1970's must be the decade in which barriers to equality will crumble in the face of our determination to create a truly Open Society.

The great adventure of space exploration must be succeeded by the great adventure of regaining the American dream of equality and justice for all. The will and the resources that made the moon-landing possible must now be poured into the great national adventure of ending poverty and inequality.

The world now knows that America is a technological giant; the world must now be shown that it is not a moral midget.

We of the Urban League dedicate ourselves to this goal of building an Open Society and we call on all Americans to join us.

We call on all Americans to escape the fear and uncertainty that has shackled the American spirit in recent years.

We call on all Americans to escape the pre-occupation with a materialism that has cheapened American life and made it shoddy for all its wealth.

We call on all Americans to rediscover the best in the American spirit—the energy, the competence, the sense of high purpose that can revitalize our country.

We call on all elements in our society, and most especially the government, whose duty it is to lead and to chart new paths and new goals, to join with us in building an Open Society.

The Urban League enters the seventies with a passion for justice, a belief in equality, and an intensity that will ensure our success. We are committed to fashioning a better way, a newer world. In the words of the great black poet, Margaret Walker Alexander:

"For my people standing staring, trying to fashion a better way from confusion, from hypocrisy and misunderstanding . . . trying to fashion a world that will hold all the people—all the faces—all the Adams and Eves and their countless generations;

"Let a new earth rise. Let another world be born. Let a people loving freedom come to growth. Let a beauty full of healing and a strength of final clenching be the pulsing in our spirits and our blood. Let the martial songs be written . . . let the dirges disappear. Let a race of men now rise and take control."

ULSTER CATHOLICS SPEAK OUT ON PREJUDICE

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, we in this country have been fighting the evils of racial prejudice for a very long time. But prejudice and its evils are not confined to racism. If we need a reminder of the fact, I direct the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the August 27 issue of the Trentonian, a respected newspaper published in my district. The article is by Mr. Cyril J. O'Brien who reports upon his experiences on a recent visit to Northern Ireland. My Speaker, in all truth, the article speaks for itself, as follows:

ULSTER CATHOLICS SPEAK OUT ON PREJUDICE

(By Cyril J. O'Brien)

DERRY.—"We are treated worse than the black man in some parts of the United States."

The young man who said that was about 22, dressed in a soiled tweed coat he had slept in for two nights, and he carried an axe handle. He would not give his name because "he's been in jail too many times already" for civil defiance.

But because I was an American the rebel barricade was let down and the young sentry and a compatriot named Francis Oakley let us across the rampart of steel-rimmed beer barrels, scaffolding and debris.

Inside was Bogside, the Catholic ghetto of this ancient-walled city. Although the majority population, they had been bound to their inferior housing for half a century by prejudice, job inequality, and gerrymandered voting districts.

Now they were tired of successive city administrations which spurned their appeals, and maintained a special sectarian auxiliary police force called "B-Specials" to uphold the establishment.

In their soft Irish voices the young men explained what they wanted told across the sea: how employers ask the school you attended to scratch Catholic applicants; how an archaic property-based voting system disenfranchises the poor—Protestants and Catholics alike.

They gathered around in a relaxed manner holding their cudgels like walking sticks, or pocketing the egg-sized cobble stones they were using against the police.

For two days now they had been holding off the Royal Ulster Constabulary which they considered sectarian and anything but an impartial law enforcement body.

IRISH BRAWL

It had all started Monday Aug. 12 when over 10,000 members of the Orange Apprentice Boys organization came here from all over Ireland and parts of Scotland to march around the Derry Walls. They sang provocative anti-Catholic songs, and then walked the Bogside ghetto. The onlookers started to pelt them. The police attacked the Bogsiders and chased them back to their ghetto. The Apprentice Boys and a swarm of bigots labeled here as "Paisleyites" supported the police.

However, the people at Bogside stopped the police at the fringe of their ghetto, pelting them back with stones, and petrol bombs, made by an outdoor "Factory" manned by young girls, boys and older women.

The battle for the Bogside was on its second day when the "rebels" let me through their barricade.

A block away from our flanking position came the sounds of falling rocks, the scramble of feet, as police charged another time. Then there was the hail like patter of the rocks (which literally looked like pepper in the sky from our position) against the shields of the constabulary. These tactics went on all throughout the day.

REBEL HEADQUARTERS

Headquarters for the rebels is a nine-story apartment building which now houses the leaders, civil rights supporters and such protagonists as pretty brown-hair Bernadette Devlin, youngest member of the British (Westminister) Parliament. From its roof flies the Tricolor of the Republic of Ireland, and Bogside "fusileers" use it as a base from where to heave their Molotov cocktails. They flew the American flag from the same staff yesterday.

Today, all of the Apprentice Boys have gone home while Derrymen fight it out alone—among themselves. Paisleyites (named for the North Ireland anti-Catholic extremist Rev. Ian Paisley) support the police and have been blamed for burning a Catholic owned factory. The rebels were getting new support from foreign students in Belfast and a handful who came up from universities in Southern Ireland.

"Tell them back in the states," said Oakley, "that all we want is one vote for one man . . . and a house for every family—Catholic or Protestant."

"Is that too much to ask?" asked a bland youth who was wearing the steel helmet he wrested from a member of the constabulary.

"Here, I want you to meet Herbert" Oakley joined in again.

LOST ONE EYE

Herbert Francis McCauley, 24, with his shaggy red hair and his tweed coat turned up at the collar looked like a prototype of an IRA member of 1916 and the later troubles with the Black and Tans.

"He lost his eye to the police," Oakley said.

"They kicked it out . . . in the Victoria barracks (police), the young man said, brushing his hand across a false eye that looked too small for its red rimmed socket.

Another flurry of stones and most of the crowd around me moved to the small alley off William St. where the battle line had been drawn.

"See we use rocks . . . not guns." one youngster explained and demonstrated by a running throw in the direction of the police.

WOULD USE GUNS

Another had no such aversion to firearms: "If we had guns it would be all over now . . ."

"Mind now," Oakley said. "We are fighting for our homes, our women and children. Last night they (Paisleyites) burned a shirt factory—where we make our living—and they marched on the Catholic Church. We had to break out of the bogside to stop them by forming a line.

"There's the flag we are fighting for," Oakley said, pointing to the insurgent tricolor, the Union Jack is hoisted above bridges and Orange halls by loyalists to confront the Catholics as much as a symbol of patriotism.

Oakley, McCauley, and the others who came around told how they welcomed the arrival of British troops as a victory. It shows the world they felt the North Government was no longer able to maintain control.

"It can only work to our good," said McCauley."

NEVER BE THE SAME

Dorman Malachy told how things will never be the same in Northern Ireland now that the events of Derry and the deaths in Ulster have focused world attention on their corner of the island.

Earlier John Hume, civil rights leader and member of the North (Stormont) Government, had expressed the same conviction to me. Like the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Hume is an advocate of non-violent demonstrations.

Hume and other civil rights leaders have made strong complaints of Orange night-riders who raid homes of Catholic ghettos with petrol bombs and who in the pattern of Ku Klux Klan—nail threatening letters on Catholic doors.

Yet, Hume believes the major problem here may be economic. The bulk of some 1,800 young workers released when a big company failed two years ago have yet to be placed. Religious prejudice simply worsens a serious situation.

Of course the matter of a united Ireland is always in the minds of the Catholic majority here in Derry and in most of Northern

Ireland, Hume explained. The south Irish consider Ireland one nation, culturally, historically. They ask Americans how they'd put up with having New England severed and annexed by Canada.

Hume feels a United Ireland will not happen, however, until it is economically feasible which might not be for some time.

Back at the barricades, however, there seemed much less hope of unity. A rosy-cheeked Ulster constabulary man, pulled up the plastic visor on his steel helmet, He and his colleagues seemed remarkably restrained in light of accusations that they attacked Irish homes in the Bogside.

Asked how it felt getting the brunt of attacks from both sides of the Derry confrontation, the constabulary man said "Not from two sides, one side. We've got one enemy—and he's in there," pointing to the Bogside.

SALUTE TO COL. HERBERT E. BLOCK, OUTSTANDING MEDICAL OFFICER

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1969, a truly outstanding medical officer, whose service dates from Pearl Harbor Day, retired from the U.S. Air Force at Carswell Air Force Base in my district. He is Col. Herbert E. Block, who for more than 5 years has served with great distinction as commander of the U.S. Air Force Hospital at Carswell.

Many of his fellow medical officers and others within the military know of this man's superlative performance as a medical officer, hospital commander, and orthopedic surgeon.

Few, however, are aware that in addition to his burdensome regular duties, Colonel Block has devoted countless hours of voluntary work out of sheer compassion for his fellow man.

Through his selfless efforts, the Carswell hospital has become recognized as one of the Nation's best medical facilities, either in or out of the military. Almost legend are the many hours he has spent almost daily, seeking to salvage broken bodies and to restore them to usefulness.

There are hundreds of families in the Fort Worth area who owe Dr. Block an outstanding debt. These are the wives, mothers and fathers, and children of our Vietnam wounded of all branches of the service who have found in Colonel Block a man of mercy and help. Working with my office and acting on his own, he has enabled more than 100 Vietnam casualties to be brought close to home and their loved ones, regardless of their branch of service and often within days of having been wounded on the battlefield. Members of the Army and Navy who otherwise would have suffered long convalescent periods hundreds and thousands of miles away from their loved ones, through this one man's actions, found the peace and nearness to home they so urgently needed. The Carswell Hospital always found room for these men, and their country was able to show them fuller appreciation as a result of Dr. Block.

It pleases me, therefore, on the occasion of his retirement to make known these facts. I am doubly proud that Dr. Block has chosen to remain in our area and continue his great medical work for the benefit of our community.

LAIRD IN LION'S LAIR

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense recently announced plans to cut $4.1 billion from the defense spending program, but those who would downgrade our military to a point of impotency immediately set up a howl for even deeper cuts. But, as the Defense Secretary has pointed out, those who are demanding further large cuts are urging a very dangerous course. An essential military strength must be maintained in the interest of national security. A succinct comment describing the Defense Secretary's position is made in an editorial appearing in the August 28, 1969, issue of the Danville, Va., newspaper, the Register. This editorial comment should prove of interest to most of my colleagues and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

LAIRD IN LION'S LAIR

It would have seemed that Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird had better judgment. Acually, he did. Yet political considerations may have altered the course in the cause of expediency.

As House Republican Leader while the Democrats were in control of the White House, he was a well-trained seeing-eye dog when it came to spending and other matters around the Pentagon. He was an expert . . . and few colleagues, regardless of party affiliations, dared question that fact or the man.

Because of Laird's knowledge of the Pentagon and his standing on Capital Hill, President Nixon turned to this fellow Republican as his choice for Secretary of Defense. Laird didn't want to make the change, pleading his value in Congress (and well aware of the fate of previous secretaries such as Robert S. McNamara).

Reluctantly, he accepted the appointment . . . and the choice was well received in Congress.

It wasn't long until it became apparent that Laird had stepped into a Lion's lair—not because of anything he did or didn't do, but because of a growing campaign against the military of which he is the symbol.

Bitter opponents of Vietnam policy started a propaganda campaign against what they termed the "military-industrial complex," intimating that the nation was being driven to bankruptcy and disaster by a conspiracy between the makers of munitions and the Pentagon. At one and the same time, they insisted that the Pentagon was a pawn of moneyed interests yet a monster controlling Congress.

Cut spending, they demanded.

When he was a member of Congress, Laird had worked for reduction in military spending . . . but never because of such an absurd accusation. Because of his stand while in Congress, Laird was placed under tremendous pressure.

So, last week, Secretary Laird announced he has cut $4.1-billion from the defense spending program inherited from the Johnson Administration.

Instead of satisfying the critics, this seemed to have whetted their appetites. They yelled for more.

The liberal Democratic Study Group hurriedly published instructions on how to probe into and attack military spending.

Attention was focused on military research, especially that part which, on the surface, seems to have little bearing on defense. Laird countered that it "provides our military strength for the future." Yet it is difficult for most people to relate such subjects as sleep and dreams to combat.

On the day before Congress started its recess, Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield slipped through the Senate a measure which could cut millions from military research projects not related directly to military functions or operations.

Actually the attack on unusual military research is designed to convince the public that the Pentagon is throwing away their tax dollars . . . thus build pressure that would result in demands that could cut into essential military spending . . . even the war effort.

Laird told the American Legion national convention in Atlanta this week that congressional critics and their supporters are "urging a very dangerous course" in demanding further large cuts. He was cheered.

With Congress in recess, the critics are busy and are getting a lot of press coverage. One could gain the impression that the majority of Congress is determined to slash military budgets. This is far from the case—as later voting on appropriations will show.

Among those who have rallied to the defense of essential military spending is Rep. W. C. 'Dan' Daniel of Virginia's Fifth District. In a letter to Secretary Laird this week, he stated:

"We can not—and must not—gamble with our nation's security. In this nuclear age, our military strength must be second to none, for there simply will be no time for crash programs to rebuild this strength should the need arise.

"So long as we keep the commitments we have throughout the world we must maintain the capability of honoring these commitments. As long as our adversaries maintain their aggressive intentions and strengthen their capabilities, we must be prepared to meet and overcome this aggression. Such a program of preparedness has my full support.

"Of course a constant vigil must be maintained against waste and unnecessary expenditures in our defense effort, but essential programs and systems must be developed and retained to assure that our defense posture is equal to or superior to that of potential adversaries."

Laird probably erred in announcing the military cuts at the time the critics had peaked their attack. It seemed that he was yielding to them. It certainly didn't silence them.

Yet, we have confidence that Laird will not yield to the danger point and will heed such advice as that offered by Congressman Daniel.

THE SOVIET INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA: THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, a year ago last month the Warsaw Pact forces, led by the Soviet Union, invaded Czechoslovakia and destroyed what had promised to be an evolutionary movement toward a more genuine form of social democracy.

We all had come to believe that perhaps the Czechoslovaks had discovered a unique formula by which they could give expression to their own inner feelings of democracy while at the same time satisfying the security requirements of their powerful neighbor, the Soviet Union.

But in this expectation, both we and the Czechoslovaks had deceived ourselves, for in the Czech experiment the Soviets had come face to face with the phenomenon of the idea of freedom asserting itself within the Communist environment. The Soviets could not tolerate this, because it presented an irreconcilable contradiction; namely, the spirit of freedom in conflict with the principle of political tyranny. If extended throughout the East European bloc, it would threaten the foundations of their totalitarian system.

What the Soviets could not accept was the basic right of nations to determine for themselves their own destiny; they could not accept the most elementary of human rights, the right of the individual to exist according to his own preferences. And so they invaded Czechslovakia; they violated these basic human rights; they violated, too, the United Nations Charter, which had held the promise of all mankind that the rights of all would be preserved.

The Soviets tried to justify their action by a clever resort to Communist sophistry: They proclaimed the Brezhnev doctrine by which they claimed for themselves the right to interfere and destroy the natural right of man to self-determination in the interests of what they called, "Socialist unity."

But this really has not worked; the Russians were kidding themselves. For the invasion of the land of a "fraternal ally" which presented no security threat to the Soviet Union has shaken the whole Communist world and has reduced enormously the prestige and respect that many of Russia's allies and friends had once held for the Soviet Union. One only has to examine the gross overstatements in Soviet declarations commemorating the first anniversary of the invasion to see that the Russians are really protesting too much. They have a guilty conscience about this, and this sense of guilt has spread to the Soviet intellectual community with the result that it has become more and more alienated from the regime.

Why should Communists with a conscience react this way? The answer, I believe, lies in the nature of the crime; namely, the violation, the destruction of a human right. The Soviets have had to live with this sense of guilt for a year, and this is only the beginning. But it will take many years for the people of Czechoslovakia to reconcile themselves to what the Soviets had done, and if reconciliation comes, it will come, not willingly, but by the sullen realization of a people faced with the choice of survival as a nation.

We, here in America, and the Czechoslovaks in their homeland, can mourn the loss of a hope, a dream, a great expectation of a better life that occurred in the wake of the onrushing Soviet tanks a year ago; but the people of Czechoslovakia, though losing their freedom have preserved their integrity and their dignity as a nation: it is the Soviets who must face the moral condemnation of mankind, including the silent condemnation of their "fraternal allies" within the Communist world.

COMMEMORATION OF APOLLO 11 FLIGHT BY OHIOANS

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Ohio, which gave "light and flight" to the world, was justifiably proud of the part its illustrious son, Neil Armstrong of Wapakoneta, Ohio, played in the historic Apollo 11 moon mission. Two of his prideful fellow Buckeyes have written poems commemorating the historic flight of Armstrong and his fellow Astronauts, Edwin E. Aldrin, of Montclair, N.J., and Michael Collins, of Houston, Tex.

As Wapakoneta hails and welcomes Neil Armstrong this weekend, I am pleased to insert these poems in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are written by Hartley F. Dailey, of Springfield, Ohio, and Thomas E. Kelley, of Wilberforce, Ohio. Mr. Dailey has also composed a touching tribute to Astronauts Virgil Grissom, Edward White and Roger Chaffee, which is also fitting to insert at this time:

MOONFIRE

How did they feel, those daring, valiant men?
Setting their feet where none had stood before,
Facing that lonely, empty, frozen world,
Knowing themselves alone, and looking up
To where old Earth rolled calmly overhead?

Didn't they feel the fear, the awful dread?
Didn't they feel the chill of things unknown,
Peering at them from down behind the rim
Of that age-old horizon, undisturbed
Until this time, by feet of earthly men?

These were the first-born, stepping bravely out
For the first time, from out of that mighty womb
Men call the Earth, which holds all earthly things
Safe in her cloying folds, nor lets them go,
Except in gravest danger and travail;
Then pleads with all her tears for their return.

Now they have shown the way, where we may go,
As those first creatures crept out from the sea
Onto some sandy beach, to make their home
In an unfriendly, hostile element.
Hail! Armstrong, Aldrin, Collins, Heroes all!
The Ultimate Adventure was your goal,
But you have brought the stars to all mankind.

HARLEY F. DAILEY.

OHIO'S PLACE ON THE MOON

The "Home of Air Travel"
Is a rightful name;
One that certainly Ohio
Can very easily claim,

From Wright Brothers at Kitty Hawk
To Armstrong on the moon;
All in sixty-six short years
Is really very soon,

From a barren N.C. hillside
To a mystic powder dust;
Billions and billions of dollars
Thousands of pounds of thrust,

Man's first flight-twelve seconds
Only one hundred twenty feet;
One third of the Apollo Saturn Rocket
That caused unknown planets to meet,

Glenn started the walks
For greater outer space;
Another famous Ohio son
Who helped set the pace,

A camera was there
For you and me to see;
The beginning of a new era
A new history to be,

The marvel of the century
With proof put there;
A joint effort of millions
For all "mankind" to share,

Pits and craters of all sizes
How did they get there?
Silent for years and years
Suddenly for us to share,

All of this programmed
Accomplished with relative ease;
Could we get these great minds
To help conquer man's disease?

We heard the President
A victory to extoll;
My! what a call he made
200,000 miles, and no toll,

"That's one small step for man,
One giant leap for mankind"
We'll share with civilization
From the moon what we find,

"Tranquillity base here—
The Eagle has landed"
Armstrong and Aldrin were walking
Collins flying the Commanded,

So man has conquered
Another mystic unknown;
A marvel for the entire world
The proof has now been shown,

"Fly me to the moon"
Once only a song fable;
Has now suddenly become
A waiting reservation table,

A popular word "fantastic"
A world gripped in prayer;
Man has conquered land and sea
He's now on the way in the air,

So if outer space may become crowded
Please of me have no fear;
For while you're on your way to Mars
I'll still be sittin' right here.

THOMAS E. KELLEY.

BRIGHT ANGELS

(A tribute to Astronauts Grissom, White and Chaffee, who died in a most tragic fire at Cape Kennedy, Jan. 27, 1967)

Now they are gone, the young, the brave, the true;
How can the world be still so fair today?
How can the mocking Sun so bravely shine?
Should not he hide his firey countenance
Behind the nimbus of the smoky pall
Raised by the altar of their sacrifice?
Greater their deeds than those of them who die,
Ringed by the lances of the enemy,
On some grim field of battle, far away.
They did not seek to kill, that some might live,
But like Prometheus they sought to bring,
Down from the sky a gift that all might share.
Such gifts are not bought lightly, some must die;
It fell their lot to pay the dearest price
Levied by Fate on all who greatly dare.

Will not the spirits of the Mighty Dead
Linger in outer space, a guardian band,
To guide their future comrades as they go
Across those endless, airless, sunless miles,
To some far planet of a distant sun
Where men may someday live in peace and love,
And grow to heights of glory yet undreamed?

HARLEY F. DAILEY.

NEW ENGLAND ELECTRIC POWER

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of electric power in New England continues to threaten this vast area of the Northeastern United States with extensive power failures. During the month of August there were severe voltage reductions by the power companies of New England.

As this situation worsens, the private utilities of New England continue to argue against one reasonable solution to the problem, the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power project to be located in northern Maine.

When the Dickey project was authorized by Congress in 1965, the private utilities of New England immediately boasted of grandiose plans which would supply all the electric power Maine and New England would ever need. These plans have never materialized, and New England's power requirements are going unmet.

The seriousness of the crisis prompted the Governor of Maine to make a public statement last week. I commend this statement to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

STATEMENT BY GOV. KENNETH M. CURTIS

It is with a feeling of grave concern that I have learned from the Maine Public Utilities Commission that on three recent occasions New England has come dangerously close to suffering a serious power shortage.

On August 4th, August 18th and August 25th there have been voltage reductions by the power companies of New England, ranging from 5% to 2%.

As Governor, it is my duty to publicly register my concern.

What is truly alarming in this situation is that in these instances, New England did not have sufficient generating capacity to maintain the required reserves. These reserves are normally 15%. They had been reduced to about 3% when the voltage reductions were ordered.

It is also clear that the shortage is based solely on failure to meet the supply of power to current users. It is equally clear that the pressing need of a power reserve for developing new industries in New England is not being met.

The private power industry has recognized this storage by creating MEPCO to transmit power from the Maritime Provinces of Canada to the New England States. Even so, this 345 KV line which is scheduled to go into effect in the fall of 1970 will not begin to meet New England's power needs. This dependence on Canadian power supply is a stop gap but not a solution.

The present situation is a graphic illustration that the planned generating capacity for New England's power needs by the dominating private utilities has been underestimated and inadequate. Expensive publicity campaigns have told us time and time again that the Big Eleven powerloop would take care of all of New England's power needs. We were told that there was no need to build the Dickey-Lincoln dam . . . that Dickey-Lincoln's power was not necessary.

What disturbs me most is the questionable estimates of future needs for electrical power that the private power industry has reported. Based on the fact that their plans for power supply today are inadequate, how can we have confidence that the power for future consumption will be ready when it is needed?

And here we are in a situation where three times in one month, New England has come close to suffering a "brown-out" of electricity, if not worse.

This startling fact of New England's shortage of power capacity calls for thorough examination of our problems and more adequate plans in both the private and public sectors.

To meet this power shortage I recommend four approaches.

First, if New England is going to have to suffer through power shortages, then the importance of building the Dickey-Lincoln project becomes more evident. And its importance is not confined to northern New England, but to all of New England. I feel it behooves those New England Congressional members who have opposed Dickey-Lincoln, perhaps out of a reasoning that it could not benefit their area, should now look to the fact that their districts may suffer power failures unless the added capacity of a Dickey-Lincoln dam is provided. This is not to mention the all-important price yardstick that a public power project would provide.

Secondly, the state Legislature should create a Maine Power Authority to enable the state to supplement the private power industry as necessary to help meet the demands of new industry and an increasing population.

Third, the private power companies should review their projections and plans for future electricity power needs.

And, finally, our plans for meeting needs for New England consumers of electricity should be more carefully coordinated throughout the New England states through both public and private cooperation.

A continued lack of power capability will certainly inhibit the economic well-being of New England. If adequate service cannot be maintained, then we stand to lose out in the competition for industry. It is a grave and an unnecessary situation that private utility management has allowed to develop.

I hope that Congress, which has before it an appropriation to continue the planning of the Dickey-Lincoln dam, will consider these new facts when its deliberations are made.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the dangerous testing of chemical-biological weapons and the handling of deadly gases has been a source of concern to the people of this Nation. The efforts of many Members of Congress have been responsible for bringing the dimensions of this problem before the Nation. As the extent of the CBW became known, I joined with other colleagues in introducing a resolution to attempt to get the United States to sign the Geneva Protocol of 1925, which outlaws the use of such weapons.

One of my constituents, Mr. Robert Carter Holmes, sent me a thoughtful paper on the problem of chemical and biological warfare. I would like to include this paper in the RECORD:

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE: A HUMAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL THREAT

I. THE DANGERS OF CBW

All sane people regard the prospect of nuclear warfare with horror. Beyond the incredible misery unleashed by use of nuclear weapons, their long-term effects on human genetics and natural ecology are immeasurable and catastrophic. The ill-effects extend to testing as well. The Japanese are nationally aware of the fate of several Japanese fishermen who were exposed to radiation emitted by American open-air tests in the Pacific. More recently, Dr. Sternglass released the results of his study of the genetic effects of tests conducted in the United States during the 1950's. He reports that radiation carried downwind from the test site caused a dramatic halt in the decline of the infant mortality rates in the affected states. While government scientists were predictably quick to disparage his interpretations of data, Sternglass' conclusions once again give rise to serious questions about the potentially tragic effects of nuclear testing. Their implications for the survivability of infants born in the aftermath of widespread nuclear war make questionable whether humanity as a species could live to re-build the world it had destroyed.

While doubts about the wisdom of nuclear warfare are widespread, only recently has public attention begun to focus on another equally dangerous field of military endeavor, the chemical and biological warfare program. As the *New York Times* said editorially on July 9, "Dean Swift himself could not do justice to a world which over the centuries and with great skill has eliminated diseases one by one for the sake of humanity, and then systematically bred the germs of those diseases as a possible weapon of war." It is often said that no nation could "win" an atomic war. Given the unpredictability of epidemics, natural or man-induced, and the immeasurable long-term consequences for the environment of chemical and bacteriological contamination, the same is true of chemical-biological weapons. The military and its advocates take great pains to present CBW as a virtuous alternative to nuclear annihilation. They argue that disabling gases and viruses are humane compared to the weapons which destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The names of the military's biological weapons are names that have struck terror in the hearts of men for centuries: anthrax, plague, brucellosis, cholera. And chemical-biological weapons can be easily produced in any well-equipped medical or biochemical laboratory at relatively low-cost, making every nation a potential military Goliath.[1]

A recent United Nations report documents "the frightful dangers of chemical and biological warfare [and] the folly of their contemplated use as well as their total unpredictability."[2] It discusses too "their possible destruction of the environment even where they do not immediately wipe out a whole population, including those who initiate their use." Even if chemical and biological weapons are never used in warfare, the research, development, testing, production and storage of such agents as VX (a nerve-gas capable of killing a man in droplet dosage) and Anthrax pose an immense

Footnotes at end of article.

threat to the health and safety of man and his environment. An expert in atmospheric microbiology writes:

"The topic [of biological warfare] is shrouded in official secrecy, but the little information already released [in 1961] suggests that, if deliberate dissemination of pathogens (or toxins) were ever attempted, contamination of the air might be one of the dangers to be anticipated." [3]

Dr. Gregory's warning holds true of both actual warfare usage and preparatory field tests alike. England provides an ominous example of the possible environmental effects of the testing of virulent biological agents. The British CBW service conducted experiments with the deadly disease Anthrax on Gruinard Island, off Scotland, in 1941. Anthrax is transmitted mainly through the skin (percutaneously) and by inhalation, and can be conveyed to humans by infected animals; it is described as "one of the most stable agents" and is "normally fatal".[4] The sheep population of Gruinard was annihilated by the tests, and today—28 years later—the island remains uninhabitable. Officials at Porton, the center of British research in chemical and biological warfare, say it will remain uninhabitable for at least 100 years to come.[5]

Gruinard Island is not the only example of the threat posed by chemical-biological warfare programs to human health and natural ecology. In 1968, a U.S. Coast Guard station on Peale Island in the Wake Atoll was evacuated after fifty persons fell mysteriously sick in one day. An Army chemical officer dispatched from Hawaii to determine the cause attributed the illnesses to leakage of a poison gas called chloropicrin from containers dumped near Wake Island after World War II.[6]

A far greater danger to the lives of millions of people came to light in North Europe during this writing. On August 11, the San Francisco *Chronicle* reported that six fishermen on a Danish trawler operating in much-used fishing grounds of the Baltic Sea developed symptoms of mustard gas poisoning. Twenty thousand tons of German chemical warfare materiel were dumped into the Baltic under British orders at the end of World War II. Gas "apparently leaked from rusting containers", contaminating the fish and nets which the fishermen handled. West German, Swedish and Danish experts launched an emergency investigation to determine the extent of seabed and water contamination, and the normally crowded resorts of Sweden's Baltic coast were quarantined. Thousands of tons of recently-netted fish destined for human consumption have been declared contaminated. Among the agents resting on the bottom of the Baltic is *Tabun*, an extremely lethal nerve gas sometimes called 'Madness Gas'.

The threat of contamination from chemical and biological warfare activities exists in the United States as well. Seymour Hersh documents several cases of such contamination near the Rocky Mountain Arsenal, a main center for CW storage. Serious pollution resulted from ill-planned disposal of arsenal waste material in open-air reservoirs during the 1950's. After the ruin of local farmland by irrigation with polluted water, and the death of large numbers of wildfowl, the Army with delay and denial hastily dug a mile-deep underground lake for waste disposal. This action in turn caused a sharp rise in the frequency of earthquakes in the vicinity of Denver, Colorado.

The best-known illustration of the danger of CBW activities came from the Dugway Proving Grounds in March, 1968. Ranchers in Skull Valley, which is 40 miles west of Dugway, discovered a large number of dead sheep one morning. By the end of the month some 6400 sheep had died. Countering the speculation of reporters, Dugway and Army officials immediately denied that any tests of toxic agents had been conducted at the site during the year. Eventually the Army admitted responsibility for the death of the sheep. The agent in question, according to Hersh, was VX, "a persistent chemical with a heavy consistency [and which] evaporates slowly".[7] The incident came during a routine test whose purpose was to determine the behavior of VX aerosol in wind. The test-plane released the gas at the scheduled moment but the doors of its spray-tanks failed to close as the plane roared skyward. Lethal gas drifted toward Interstate Highway 40, "a heavily travelled route which serves as the main link between the Midwest and Northern California". An unexpected change in wind direction carried the gas instead to Skull Valley.

Chemical and biological warfare activities—including research, development, testing, production and storage—present a tremendous and incalculable danger to human life and natural environment. What the *New York Times* called "the solemn lunacy of stockpiling lethal bacteria and poisonous gases in the name of national defense" is a direct threat to every human being.

While military and civilian supporters often argue that chemical-biological warfare programs are oriented to defense against a potential CBW aggressor, the distinction between defensive and offensive work in this field is tenuous at best. Too, the programs are defended on the grounds that their by-products, presumably like those of the space and nuclear programs, promise many peaceful benefits. In this connection, it is useful to remember that the profession of the military is not public health but *warfare*, and that any peaceful by-products are, by the nature of the profession, just that: by-products of death-oriented work. As Dr. Gregory stated, "The published studies on air-sampling equipment and epidemiology that come from official defense laboratories are small compensation for this threat by man to his own health and agriculture." [8]

Public health and ecology are not military specialties. On May 8, congressman Richard D. McCarthy (D-N.Y.) revealed to the press that the Army was planning to transport "obsolete" chemical agents from the Rocky Mountain Arsenal in Colorado and the Edgewood Arsenal in Maryland to the Naval Ammunition Depot at Earle, New Jersey. The agents were to be carried across country, through heavily populated areas, in approximately 1100 railroad cars over a three-month period; they would then be transferred to four Liberty ships and carried to a spot 250 miles into the Atlantic where they would be sunk. The operation was scheduled to begin on May 16 and continue into August. The San Francisco *Chronicle* reported on May 9 that the Transportation Department "had granted the Army the necessary permit". General James A. Hebbeler, chief of Chemical-Biological-Radiological and Nuclear Operations, told a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee that similar operations had been carried out in the past involving a total of twelve Liberty ships. He assured Congress that "stringent safety precautions" would be taken.

On May 15, the *Chronicle* reported that Assistant Secretary of the Interior Leslie L. Glasgow testified before the same subcommittee that the Army did not inform his Department of the disposal plan until two days after Representative McCarthy's public statement. He said he opposed the plan "in principle" but gave it his "qualified endorsement as the least objectionable way of doing a necessary job". Representative McCarthy told the same subcommittee that the chief engineer at Edgewood Arsenal disputed the Army's official contention that ocean disposal was the best method. The engineer said that the agents—which were never publicly identified, but some of which were apparently loaded in cluster bombs—could be destroyed in one year by use of caustic soda. Charles L. Poor, Acting Assistant Army Secretary for Research and Development, said the Army would not have to resort to disposal at sea in the future because, in UPI's words, "it will no longer amass huge quantities of them and [sic!] because newer agents are easier to decontaminate where they are . . ."

Congressional uproar forced the Army to submit its plan to the National Academy of Sciences for "independent" review. The scheme was eventually dropped at the recommendation of NAS and the agents were to be defused by other means which would not require transcontinental shipping.

UPI did not say what "newer agents" Secretary Poor had in mind. But it was clear that one public embarrassment was not going to deter the Pentagon from pursuing its CBW program at full-speed. Even in the heat of the controversy over the ocean disposal plan, Representative McCarthy learned that the Army was testing what the *Chronicle* called "a lethal strain of encephalitis" at the Dugway Proving Grounds, site of the tests which killed 6400 sheep a year before. The proper name of the disease was Venezuelan Equine Encephalitis (VEE), which is "a virus disease that can cause crippling damage to the human central nervous system".[9]

Poor's statement illustrates the duplicity of the Pentagon's dealings with Congress and the public in the question of CBW. Both contentions cannot be simultaneously true: either the Army will *not* amass quantities of CB agents, or those agents it *will* amass will be more easily decontaminated. A letter sent by Brigadier General Hebbeler in response to a letter I wrote condemning the sea disposal plan contains similarly contradictory implications. He wrote:

"Marine biologists and oceanographers were consulted. They determined that at the depth of the planned disposal there would be no effect on the ecology. At the great depth, 7200 feet, where it is proposed to place this material, there is virtually no significant fish life and the water is very quiet, almost unmoving. It takes some forty years for a sample of water at that great depth to rise to the surface."

The letter continued with the unlikely copulative "Moreover (sic: i.e. 'if that doesn't convince you . . .'),

"if any leakage should occur, hydrolysis would quickly make the agent harmless. The agents involved would be decomposed if consumed and there would be no accumulation of poison in the body. Thus if a fish is accidentally exposed to these agents it would not be harmful if consumed by man or other fish."

Some questions which immediately come to mind reading this letter are: if hydrolysis can decontaminate the agents (whose toxicity, according to Hebbeler, "has been highly exaggerated") with such ease and efficiency, why could this process not have been used instead of ocean disposal? Why does Hebbeler argue first that the agents will not contaminate fish because fish do not live in the depths proposed (i.e. if they did they might be contaminated?) but then deny that the agents would be capable of harming anything anyhow (i.e. regardless of their depth)? If, indeed, the agents are not susceptible to such hydrolitic decontamination—as the need to use caustic soda would indicate—then why it is not just as dangerous if they leak and rise to the surface 40 years hence rather than one or two years hence? This argument sounds very much like carelessly deferring the potential disaster to a future generation, a sort of argument often heard from the Pentagon.

General Hebbeler also said in his letter, "Every effort has been made to avoid having the trains go through major metropolitan areas. Trains will not stop in any towns or cities." Yet ABC News on May 8 showed that

Footnotes at end of article.

these efforts would not prevent the nerve-gas trains to pass within yards of schools, hospitals and crowded residential areas. The Army continued for months to deny, in the face of overwhelming evidence, that chemical warfare tests were responsible for the Skull Valley incident. How long would the Army have denied responsibility for the massive tragedy which might well have occurred had the planned disposal of lethal chemical agents been conducted as scheduled?

II. FUNDING THE CBW PROGRAM

A major difficulty facing opponents of the chemical and biological warfare program is the failure of the Pentagon to make available a comprehensive and itemized budget. When Senator McIntyre's Research Committee tried to learn exactly how much of the proposed appropriation was to be spent on CB research and development, they faced the formidable task of sifting hundreds of individual items from the immense Pentagon budget; military budget writers had not seen fit to group them together in one category. The result can be misleading indeed, and even congressmen have little recourse.

McIntyre's subcommittee, after long investigation and "considerable checking with the military", found that the Pentagon planned to spend $88 million on CBW research and development, "of which $16 million was for 'offensive uses' ".[10] The subcommittee decided to eliminate the $16 million marked 'offensive' but recommended authorization of the remaining $72 million, which it assumed to be for strictly defensive work. Senator McIntyre reasoned, "We must do all we can to protect our people and our troops against biological and chemical agents, but measured against this nation's traditional opposition to the offensive use of such agents we could not justify the research and development expenditures for that purpose." The program, according to McIntyre, would have faced even heavier cuts on the floor had the subcommittee not first demonstrated that it had reviewed the CBW budget carefully with blue pencil in hand. The assumption seemed to be that the program was, indeed, primarily defensive and, with the exception of specifically offensive R&D, should be continued.

The subcommittee's findings, however, do not square with statements made earlier in the year by the Pentagon's chief of CBR and Nuclear Operations, General Hebbeler. Testifying before an unofficial group of concerned congressmen and senators, he acknowledged that the military planned to spend no less than $350 million on chemical and biological warfare during fiscal 1969. Approximately half of this amount—some $175 million—was said to be earmrked for research and development, and the other half for "production".[11] Thus the Pentagon itself, through its top CBW official, admitted to a CBW research and development expenditure twice that determined by Senator McIntyre's subcommittee. But the obvious question arising from Hebbeler's informal testimony is why the Pentagon requires another $175 million for "production." Production of what? Representative McCarthy provided part of the answer on July 15 when he disclosed that the Army was allegedly planning a new "chemical cluster weapon for toxic payloads." He said that D.O.D. had advertised for contractors' bids on February 2, and that production was to begin soon at Newport, Indiana.[12] Seymour Hersh, in his recent book ***Chemical and Biological Warfare, America's Hidden Arsenal,*** identifies the Newport Chemical Plant as "the military's manufacturing plant for the nerve gas VX", built in late 1959 or early 1960 with a capital investment of $13.5 million and operated (as of 1962, the last year such figures were released) at an annual cost of $3.5 million.[13] While the near total secrecy surrounding the entire program makes judgment difficult, it is a fair guess that a good portion of the $175 million tagged 'production' supports the manufacture of offensive chemical and biological weapons.

But experience strongly suggests that Pentagon officials, with their vested interest in securing Congressional fund authorization, tend greatly to underestimate the costs of their own operations. Hersh wrote in the June, 1969, issue of ***Ramparts*** that the true expenditure planned for CBW programs in fiscal 1969 is twice what General Hebbeler admitted. He refers to a newsletter published for the defense industry by the Defense Marketing Service which put the 1969 budget of the Edgewood Arsenal alone at $421.5 million, "of which $57.3 million is earmarked for research, $266.4 million for procurement, $9.6 million for operating costs and $1.9 million for stock funds". The question, again, is 'procurement of what'? Hersh quotes the same semi-official source as saying that the budget of Fort Detrick (Md.), which is the main center of biological warfare work, is $29.8 million, and that "more than $75 million" was to be spent on four other CW and BW bases. If these figures are accurate, the CBW budget for fiscal 1969 amounts to no less than $526.3 million—considerably more than General Hebbeler admitted.

The figures cited by Hersh are for the Army's CBW program. But the Air Force and Navy also conduct research, development and testing in this area. One Navy research center alone, the Naval Biological Laboratory in Oakland, California, which is operated by the School of Public Health of the University of California, Berkeley, reportedly had a budget of $1,636,472 in fiscal 1969.[14] Hersh quotes an unnamed "Senate source with access to classified CBW spending totals" as saying that "$650 million a year on CBW is a conservative figure." [15]

How much of this total—whether we accept Hebbeler's $350 million or Hersh's higher estimates—goes for research and development of chemical-biological warfare agents and delivery systems cannot be estimated without more specific information, information which the Pentagon is careful to keep from public and Congressional view. But it should be clear, whatever total is accepted, that CBW work—including production of offensive agents at such plants as Newport—costs considerably more than what Senator McIntyre found. It follows that elimination of a mere $16 million from the CBW budget, as recommended by the Senator's subcommittee, will not go very far toward effective limitation. An investigation which looks into R&D but ignores procurement and production, moreover, is unlikely to yield a sound estimate of the military's expenditure on offensive programs. Without such knowledge it is impossible to eliminate offensive programs from the budget.

III. THE DEFENSIVE-OFFENSIVE PROBLEM

The cuts made by Senator McIntyre's subcommittee were designed to eliminate "offensive uses". But the distinction between 'offensive' and 'defensive' is very difficult to make in the field of chemical-biological warfare. Elinor Langer discusses this problem in a paper given at a conference in London. "With a few exceptions, such as development of detection and protective equipment, little CBW research can be accurately described as defensive . . ." She continues, "Because of the nature of chemical and biological weapons, research even in seemingly 'pure' areas, such as the development of vaccines, has at least equal implications for offensive and defensive use." A U.S. Army CBW manual itself says, "CB defense is a prerequisite to an attack capability". Adequate testing even of a simple gas-mask requires the ability to simulate the sort of attack against which it is to provide protection. A good example of the difficulty of making clear distinctions in this area was provided by the Army itself when, on July 16, it announced the suspension of open-air testing of poison gas at Fort McClellan, Alabama, and Edgewood Arsenal in Maryland. The tests conducted at Edgewood were admittedly offensive; but those done at Fort McClellan were termed defensive since they were part of a training program in the detection and deactivation of nerve agents. These training exercises, however, required the use of "small amounts of sarin nerve gas, mustard gas and a particularly deadly form of nerve gas known simply as VX".[17] Here, the defensive-offensive distinction is based solely on the intention behind the tests; there is no difference between the lethal gas used in a test of defensive equipment and the same gas used in offensive operations. In fact, defensive tests of this sort *require* an offensive capability, including means of delivering and dispersing the lethal agents. In either case the agents are just as lethal.

One expert in the field summarized the problem in this way: "One of the characteristic features of biological weapons", wrote Czech academician Malek, "is that it is difficult to distinguish work done purely for defensive ends from that which is mainly offensive. Furthermore, if defense is to be effective and prepared in time it must be based on knowledge that can easily be transferred to offensive uses. That is why military establishments working on the development of these weapons do it mostly under the label of defense". [18] The difference, in other words, is betweer two kinds of *intentions* rather than two kinds of *abilities*. If a nation is to be capable of defending its troops against sophisticated chemical and biological weapons then it must perforce have the ability to simulate the conditions under which such defense would be appropriate. The tests done at Fort McClellan could be duplicated in Vietnam: the terrain, subjects and intentions would be different; the lethal effects would be the same.

Beyond the probability that the 'offensive uses' fund was vastly larger than McIntyre *et al* concluded, the foregoing would suggest the difficulty of isolating any such category from the rest of the CBW budget. It is difficult to argue against defense; it is relatively easy, though, to conduct offensive programs under a defensive guise. The need to develop adequate defense can be invoked to justify (or prostituted to camouflage) a wide range of offensive capabilities. Too, it can add fuel to a new dimension of the arms race and serve as an ideological substitute to serious international efforts for disarmament.

Is adequate defense against chemical and biological weapons possible? Any argument for the necessity to develop defensive equipment must begin with an affirmative answer to this question. But many non-government students of CBW and its related sciences have grave doubts.

The difficulty of finding antidotes to the wide variety of actual and potential chemical and bacteriological agents can be easily understood when it is realized that a primary object in development of such agents is precisely that they resist treatment. Should virile biologicals bred to resist antibiotics be released in a heavily populated environment by surprise attack, effective mass treatment would be for all practical purposes impossible. Even if sensitive air-samplers should detect the presence of infectious microbes the delay between alert and mass treatment would assure large numbers of deaths. Advance immunization against all the known epidemiological agents, impractical as it would be, would still provide no protection against *mutant* forms which a potential enemy presumably would be prepared to use offensively to off-set defensive immunization. Similar barriers stand in the way of effective defense against chemical agents. To cite but one example, a dosage of 0.054 milligrams of the phosphate compound Sarin (a widely

Footnotes at end of article.

stored chemical agent), applied to 0.4 cm^2 of skin, is capable of killing 50% of the target population (data from tests on guinea pigs). [The expression for this dosage, LD_{50}, means lethal dose capable of killing half the target population.] In another test, Sarin was applied to a sample of guinea pigs in an effort to test the effect of washing in soap as an antidote. All of the animals tested which were washed twice within 10 or more minutes of application of Sarin died despite the washings. Of those washed within 5 minutes, 30% survived; of those washed within 2 minutes, 80%.[20] This is but one example of the lethality of such agents and the difficulty of securing adequate treatment in time should they be used in warfare (or dispersed accidentally).[21]

If the military is serious about its desire to defend the United States against chemical and biological attack, it is curious indeed that not a single effort has been made (to my knowledge) even to educate the population to basic measures which might be taken in the event such an attack should occur. If CBW broke out tonight the civilian population (and probably the military as well) would have absolutely no defense against it. This does not argue well for the "defensive" aspect of the military's CBW program.

IV. CBW AS A DETERRENT: THE ENDLESS SPIRAL

"Clearly, failure to maintain an effective chemical warfare deterrent would endanger national security."—Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, Washington, July 9, 1969.

On Friday, August 8, Senator McIntyre introduced an amendment to the military procurement bill which would place a series of restrictions on the chemical-biological warfare program. The intent of the amendment, which was approved by the Senate 91–0, is clearly to prevent the Pentagon to develop and produce offensive CB weapons and delivery systems. On Saturday, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird expressed his approval of the proposed amendment, an action which the *New York Times* called "acknowledging the inevitable." But Secretary Laird's comments in endorsing McIntyre's bill cast doubt on both Laird's intentions and the likelihood that the amendment will achieve the desired result. He said, "I believe this revised amendment will allow us to maintain our chemical warfare deterrent and our biological research program, both of which are essential to the national security." Laird has previously made clear on several occasions that he holds the CBW program vital to America's security; he has shown little interest in reducing or phasing out the program. It is instructive that, in his endorsement, the Secretary tried to defend the maintenance of the very program whose abolition (as an offensive-capability "deterrent") he seemed to support.

Laird's argument for CBW rests on the notion, so familiar in its application to nuclear weaponry and most recently the Safeguard ABM system, that to avoid a holocaust it is necessary to maintain a "credible deterrent." This "argument-from-deterrence" can be and has been used to justify any and all military procurement programs on the grounds that if we don't have the ability to destroy them, then they will destroy us. The balance of terror, implies Laird, is now extended to the chemical-biological arena. "The history of the use of lethal chemical warfare agents has demonstrated on three notable occasions in this century that the only time military forces have used these weapons is when the opposing forces had no immediate capability to deter or to retaliate. This was true early in World War I, later in Ethiopia and more recently in Yemen. Clearly, failure to maintain an effective chemical warfare deterrent would endanger national security." [22]

These comments were made ostensibly in support of a bill which imposes six major restrictions on the CBW program. It [1] requires bi-annual reports detailing what CBW funds are used for; [2] forbids the development of "delivery systems specifically designed to disseminate lethal chemical agents, disease-producing biological micro-organisms or biological toxins"; [3] requires notice to Congress and the nation concerned whenever such weapons are stored overseas; [4] requires notice to the relevant legislative and administrative bodies of any plans to transport such agents within the United States; [5] forbids the placement outside the United States of CBW agents unless the Secretary of State deems it consistent with international law; and [6] forbids open-air testing of lethal agents unless declared by the Surgeon-General to pose no hazard to public health.[23]

In standard Pentagon usage the term 'deterrent' signifies the capability to launch an independent attack-in-kind upon an actual or would-be aggressor. Whether used for a pre-emptive 'first strike' or a retaliatory response to an adversary's attack, a deterrent presumes the technological ability to launch an offensive attack. That Laird used the term in its ordinary sense is confirmed by his reference to those unfortunate countries which lacked the ability "to deter *or to retaliate*" (my emphasis). It is strange indeed, then, that the Secretary used this argument to support a bill which specifically forbids the development of an essential ingredient of a deterrent (i.e. offensive) capability, a delivery system. Could it be that Laird knows something the Senate does not?

Laird acknowledged that "the deterrent aspects of biological research are not as sharply defined [as those of chemical warfare]", but added that 'a continued biological research program . . . is vital on two other major counts. First, we must strengthen our protective capabilities in such areas as vaccines and therapy. Secondly, we must minimize the dangers of technological surprise." In this connection, it is useful to recall the statement of the Czech academician quoted earlier (cf. page 10): "It is difficult to distinguish work done purely for defensive ends from that which is mainly offensive . . . If defense is to be effective and prepared in time it must be based on knowledge that can easily be transferred to offensive uses. That is why military establishments working on the development of these weapons do it mostly under the label of defense."

As on previous occasions it is difficult to judge exactly what Laird has in mind. The amendment was revised in consultation with Dr. John Foster, chief or research and engineering at the Pentagon. Foster and Laird can be counted upon to do all in their power to maintain the CBW program. Ultimately, the failure of Congress to eliminate the funds necessary to development of offensive chemical and biological weapons and delivery systems, despite restrictive amendments, will leave the Pentagon free to circumvent the sense of the McIntyre effort. Elimination of a mere $16 million from a program admitted by the Pentagon itself to cost at least $350 million will do little to counter this distinct possibility.

The chemical and biological warfare program in all its aspects—research and development, testing, production, storage and shipping—is a grave threat to the health and safety of all Americans. Its proliferation throughout the world is a serious danger to all mankind. As J. B. Neilands said, "It is up to the U.S., as a super power notoriously delinquent in the field, to take the initiative in working out effective international control measures which would halt the spread of CBW weapons." [24] The United States should immediately ratify the Geneva Protocol of 1925, which bans the first-use of CB weapons in warfare. It should then press for quick international agreement to forbid the production and stockpiling of lethal chemical and biological agents. A strong sense-of-Congress resolution to this effect would set the stage for such negotiations. But more effective than this would be a thorough Congressional investigation of the entire CBW program, followed by elimination from the Pentagon's budget of all funds which could be used to develop and maintain a "deterrent" (offensive) capability in this field. The traditional duplicity of the Pentagon on this question, and the recent statements of Secretary Laird, suggest that a very sharp watch will be required to assure that the Pentagon does not do in the name of "defense" what the McIntyre amendment—and all sane world opinion—forbid it to do in the name of "offense".

FOOTNOTES

[1] Cf. Seymour Hersh, *Chemical and Biological Warfare, America's Hidden Arsenal*, Anchor Books, 1969, chapter 10.

[2] *New York Times* editorial, 9 July 1969.

[3] P. H. Gregory, *The Microbiology of the Atmosphere*, London, 1961, p. 198.

[4] Steven Rose, ed., *CBW—Chemical and Biological Warfare*, Beacon Press, 1969, Table 5.

[5] TV documentary "A Plague on Your Children", KQED-TV, 21 July 1969.

[6] *NYT*, 4 July 1969.

[7] S. Hersh, "On Uncovering the Great Nerve Gas Coverup", *Ramparts*, June 1969.

[8] Gregory, *loc. cit.*

[9] Hersh, *Ramparts* article.

[10] *NYT*, 4 July 1969.

[11] *ibid.*, 5 March 1969.

[12] *ibid.*, 16 July 1969.

[13] Hersh, *Chemical and Biological Warfare*, pp. 87–8.

[14] *ibid.*, p. 194. Cf. also "The Uses of U.C. Berkeley Research," Radical Student Union report, Berkeley.

[15] *Ramparts*, June 1969.

[16] Rose, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 120.

[17] *NYT*, 17 July 1969.

[18] Rose, ed., *op cit.*, pp. 55–6.

[19] Van Wazer, ed., *Phosphorus and Its Compounds*, New York, 1961, p. 1926.

[20] *ibid.*, p. 1927.

[21] Rose, ed., *op. cit.*, pp. 30–31, and pp. 53–7.

[22] San Francisco *Chronicle*, 10 August 1969.

[23] *NYT*, 10 August 1969.

[24] J. B. Neilands, "The Need to Eliminate the Doomsday Bug," American Medical News, July 7, 1969. Dr. Neilands is professor of biochemistry at UC Berkeley, and chairman of the Scientists' Committee on Chemical and Biological Warfare.

A REMARKABLE ACCOMPLISHMENT FOR ANY PRESIDENT

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, from time to time this year we have heard the demands of the experts and the pundits for a faster pace from this administration. They have decried the lack of feverish activity characteristic of recent past administrations and have pointed accusingly at all they think is wrong.

Unfortunately, many of those living and working in the Nation's Capital listen to the voices of the soothsayers and unaccountably mistake them for the voice of the people.

Only when they get out to where most Americans really live—California, Michigan, Iowa, the other great States—do they find that the voice of the people really sounds quite different and is saying different things.

Getting back to one's State or district reminds us not to pay too much attention to what we hear and read in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the Gallup poll shows—and has shown all year—that Americans do not share the views of the so-called opinionmakers who seize every opportunity to criticize and belittle the President. Mr. Gallup's findings are indeed interesting. His last poll, taken in mid-August, shows that 62 percent of the American people approve of the job the President is doing and only 20 percent disapprove.

For the first 7 months of his administration, the President has averaged 63 percent approval, a remarkable accomplishment for any President.

I insert the results of the Gallup poll for the last 7 months in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 28, 1969]

THE GALLUP POLL: NIXON HOLDS APPROVAL OF 62 PERCENT, POINT UNDER 7-MONTH AVERAGE

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., August 27.—President Nixon wins a vote of confidence from 62 per cent of American adults in the latest nationwide survey conducted Aug. 15 through 18.

The latest percentage is 3 points lower than the figure recorded in the previous survey, which was taken shortly following the spectacular moon landing July 20, but is virtually the same as the President's average rating of 63 per cent for his seven months in office.

In the latest survey a total of 1532 adults in more than 300 carefully-selected areas were asked:

Do you approve or disapprove of the way Nixon is handling his job as President?

Here are the latest results and the trend since President Nixon took office:

NIXON POPULARITY

[In percent]

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
Aug. 15–18	62	20	18
July 26–28	65	17	18
July 11–14	58	22	20
June 20–23	63	16	21
May 23–26	65	12	23
May 16–20	65	12	23
May 2–5	64	14	22
Apr. 11–14	61	11	28
Mar. 28–31	63	10	27
Mar. 14–17	65	9	26
Feb. 21–24	61	6	33
Jan. 23–29	59	5	36
Average	63	13	24

All persons who answered the first question were then asked *why* they approve (or disapprove). Following are the reasons given by those who *approve:*

Reasons for approving

[In percent]

General comments ("he's doing his best")	17
His approach to problems	14
Trying hard to end Vietnam war	13
Has handled problems well to date	8
Welfare proposals	5
Building good relations with other nations	3
Economic policies	3
Miscellaneous replies	7
No opinion, no answer	8
Total	[1] 78

[1] Total adds to more than 62 percent who approve since some persons gave more than one reason.

Those who gave reasons relating to Nixon's approach to problems frequently used these adjectives or phrases: "calm," "businesslike," "cautious," "firm," "deliberate," "seeks advice from others."

Reasons given by those who disapprove of Nixon's performance fall into the following categories:

Reasons for disapproving

[In percent]

Vietnam policies	4
Has not kept campaign promises (Vietnam, surtax)	4
General comments ("don't like anything he does")	4
Economic policies	3
Miscellaneous	8
No opinion, no answer	1
Total	[1] 24

[1] Total adds to more than 20 percent who disapprove since some persons gave more than one reason.

NIXON, WELFARE, AND POLITICS

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roscoe Drummond is one of the Nation's most widely read and widely respected columnists and political analysts.

Recently, he discussed the impact of the President's new domestic programs in the field of welfare and revenue sharing.

I think Mr. Drummond's column is worthy of being a part of the permanent RECORD. It follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 20, 1969]

NIXON, WELFARE, AND POLITICS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The impact of the Nixon welfare revolution on national policy and presidential politics will be immense.

It shows that the administration is moving much further and much faster on the domestic front than either its critics or its supporters believed likely.

It shows that President Nixon has made the crucial political decision to draw together a durable Republican majority from the political center rather than from the Wallace conservatives.

It is clear that the President has decided that he cannot wait as long as he hoped, before beginning to deal with pressing domestic issues. He put it bluntly in his watershed speech on welfare: "We face an urban crisis, a social crisis—and at the same time, a crisis of confidence in the capacity of government to do its job."

He is starting to take on all three sooner than he planned. He is not waiting for the end of the financial burden of the Vietnam war and he is not waiting until he has gotten inflation under control. The heavy cost of the new welfare and antipoverty and revenue-sharing measures will not begin for another year, but what is important is that the administration is taking first steps and is embracing the "abolition of poverty" as a national commitment.

Obviously such significant steps will evoke differences of opinion in detail and substantial criticism from those on the right who feel the President is plunging into socialism and those on the left who feel he is doing too little.

I am inclined to think that the administration is moving in the direction which will tend to unify the nation by correcting past failures and by demonstrating that it does not intend to neglect the nation's acute social problems by pretending nothing much can be done about them.

The federal government rarely acts until the national consensus has been reached. Time was when talk about ending extreme poverty was far-out—like believing that you could go to the moon was proof that you were some kind of a nut.

Not now. Today President Nixon and his opponent in last year's election, Hubert Humphrey, the leaders of the labor unions and the executives American Manufacturers Association are agreed that widespread poverty in the United States in the midst of widespread plenty is intolerable because it is no longer necessary.

Nixon has now laid out a program to Congress which rests on that premise.

My judgment is that it will turn out to be both good policy and good politics.

The political dividends are likely to be very considerable.

The federal revenue sharings start will mark the beginning of decentralization of Big Government which the American people has long sought. This has been traditional Republican doctrine; but two years ago Democratic liberals began to talk in favor of it until President Johnson spoke against it. Now Nixon is making it a reality.

At the same time the wage supplements will go a long way toward dissolving the pervasive resentment of the working poor against seeing so many on relief getting more from the government without working than they earn by working.

The whole antipoverty-relief revolution which Nixon is undertaking, termed by the usually anti-Nixon New York Times as "original and constructive," is a blend of conservative and liberal concepts. It is conservative in that it aims to take people off relief rolls and get them on payrolls, provides a strong incentive to work and begin the flow of political initiative, money and responsibility to states and cities.

It is traditionally liberal in that the administration is prepared to accept large federal spending to achieve an urgent social goal.

The President most likely sees his new program as neither liberal nor conservative—but as practical and necessary.

TAKES TOO MUCH FOR GRANTED

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, there are many areas of unrest in this Nation today which are disturbing to a great many Americans. Considerable doubt has been raised in the minds of some people whether this Nation is entering a period of decay and on the verge of crumbling.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a great majority of Americans who have an unwavering faith in their country. They are men who believe in the principles upon which this Nation was founded. They are men who decry the irrational acts of some which dominate today's news headlines.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to one such man, Tony Kastan, of 403 Chicago Avenue, Elizabeth, Pa. Mr. Kastan is a member of the Blaine Hill Sportsmen Association in Elizabeth and recently expressed his opinions in a letter which was published in an edition of the Daily News, McKeesport, Pa. I include herewith a copy of his letter for printing in the Extensions of Remarks:

TAKES TOO MUCH FOR GRANTED

Quite often it seems human nature dictates that we take too much for granted in life. By contrast, many people in oppressed countries would welcome permission and gladly accept the right to practice religious freedom—but cannot. In our democratic state a countless number is afforded this opportunity—and will not. Rebellious students should be quelled in their defiant uprisings—and are not.

Well, remember how the insidious and relentless probings of termites usually result in structural collapse? Unfortunately, we also have in this great country a different type of digger which surpasses by far the common variety. And conceivably, our general pattern of living could one day be altered—and that should never be! For the benefit of all, don't let it ever happen in America!

TONY KASTAN.

NEW YORK STATE YOUNG DEMOCRATS ADOPT PLATFORM

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of the platform adopted by the New York State Young Democrats at their annual convention, held in Cooperstown, N.Y., on June 28.

This platform deals extensively with national, as well as State issues and is, on the whole, a most impressive document. It contains a number of original and provocative ideas and deserves to be widely read, even by those who might sharply disagree with sections of it.

Under unanimous consent, I include it herewith:

THE 1969 PLATFORM OF THE NEW YORK STATE YOUNG DEMOCRATS

PREAMBLE

It is the nature of democracy that it must daily meet threats to its own existence. Today, more than ever before, we face a major challenge to the existence of American democracy.

The promise of full equality for all Americans made by our Founding Fathers almost 200 years ago has not yet been fulfilled. The promise of freedom for all Americans made over 100 years ago has not yet been realized. To the young people of this country belongs the responsibility for living up to those obligations.

If our democratic society does not work for all Americans, it works for none of us. Poverty, hunger, discrimination, unemployment, poor housing, inflation—these are among the conditions which a truly democratic society cannot tolerate.

Change does not come easily to any society, particularly a society which is basically affluent. During the last few years, the forces of change have met with increasing resistance and misunderstanding. Despite the increasing fear, violence and hatred in our society, the need for change remains.

As Young Democrats, we want to see democracy work for every member of our society. We seek the power and the responsibility to participate in making the decisions which will shape our destiny. Our appeal is not for a voice but for a voice that will be heeded. We are in a revolt against the established order, the status quo. History is on our side, and in one way or another we will achieve a large measure of success in our endeavors. What is important is that our goals be achieved in the most responsible and effective manner possible.

We stand committed to the task of helping to build a Democratic Party which encourages the full and active participation of young people within all levels of its organization. We dedicate ourselves to working within the political process to create a Democratic Party which will inspire all Americans and provide the leadership which is needed if this nation is to achieve the democracy to which our Founding Fathers dedicated themselves 200 years ago.

1. Domestic welfare

A. Jobs

1. We favor the increased cooperation of government and business to create on-the-job training for those who lack the skills necessary to get a decent job.

2. We favor the elimination of all racial barriers in labor unions to the training and hiring of members of minority groups.

3. We favor the concept of government being the employer of last resort. We recommend that the State and Federal governments establish programs that will guarantee that every member of our society has a gainful job.

B. Education

1. We propose that legislation be enacted which would re-establish low interest loans for New York State residents attending schools of higher learning.

2. We propose that the State make scholarship funds available to students who wish to attend schools of higher learning outside of New York State.

3. We further propose that the State make increased scholarship funds available for all students who seek higher education.

4. We recommend that the State Board of Regents undertake a study to determine the feasibility of making higher education available to all those who desire it.

5. We suggest that each college and university in New York study the possibility of lessening the emphasis on academic performance in high school as the major standard for admittance to colleges. At the same time, recognizing that poor academic training results in poor high school marks, we suggest that all educational units in the State do everything possible to upgrade education on the high school level.

6. We believe that colleges throughout New York State should implement plans which would guarantee that students will have a major voice in the policymaking of the institutions which they attend.

C. Welfare

1. We favor the elimination of the abuses of the welfare system as soon as possible so that welfare assistance is given to those in need, as intended.

2. We favor the establishment of national standards for welfare programs at a minimal level of those in New York State.

3. We propose that the Federal government assume a major share of the cost of welfare programs.

4. We believe that all practices which result in making of welfare recipients second-class citizens must be eliminated.

5. We favor the establishment of more day-care centers to enable mothers on welfare to be free to get jobs.

6. We favor a change in the standards for Aid to Dependent Children so that both parents may reside with the family unit.

D. Housing

1. We propose that income limits for continued occupancy in public housing be abolished and that tenants be permitted to remain in public housing no matter what their incomes, provided that they pay increased rent commensurate with their income.

2. We also propose that rents for all public housing projects in the State be determined on an ability-to-pay basis.

3. We believe that New York State must make a firm commitment to the rehabilitation or elimination of its more than 6 million substandard dwelling units.

4. We favor increased incentives for the private sector to build low- and middle-income housing.

5. We favor the increased use of scatter housing and the gradual dispersal of concentrations of people from urban to suburban areas.

6. We deplore the fact that there are housing units in New York State without running water. We recommend that New York State make financial assistance available to provide indoor plumbing in such residences.

7. We urge the legislature to establish a program of low interest mortgages for purchasers of co-operative apartments.

E. Health

1. We condemn the recent cutbacks in state funds for welfare and Medicaid, and propose that the State adopt an adequate program of health and hospital care for needy citizens of all ages.

2. We propose the relaxation of the State's abortion laws.

3. We propose the establishment of a far-reaching state program of half-way houses for narcotics addicts seeking to rejoin the mainstream of society.

4. We propose an increased state program for the voluntary treatment of narcotics addicts, and that such addicts be treated not as criminals but as people who are sick.

F. Poverty

1. We declare our unequivocal support for the war on hunger throughout this nation.

2. We favor making food stamps available to those in need at no cost.

3. We declare our unequivocal support for the striking grape workers of California and for all workers who seek a decent wage and the right to organize for their own welfare. Further, as Young Democrats, we will participate and urge others to join us in the boycott of table grapes.

4. We propose that the State undertake programs which encourage the private sector to assist in making the promise of democracy and our free enterprise system a reality for the poor and the members of minority groups.

2. Peace

1. We favor a unilateral cease-fire on the part of the United States in Vietnam.

2. We favor the increased withdrawal of American military forces from Vietnam to be completed no later than by the end of 1970.

3. We urge all New York State elected officials to oppose the deployment of the presently-proposed Anti-Ballistic Missile System. We are not in favor of the research and development of the system and are adamantly opposed to deployment at any time. This opposition stems from the following observations:

(1) *National priorities.*—We feel that at this time in the United States, our society has placed demands upon its government that are in conflict with the A.B.M. Domestic crises, such as urban decay, racial conflict, inflation, etc. force us to place

our internal problems in the highest priority.

(2) *Escalation of the arms race.*—We feel that deployment of an A.B.M. system at this time would upset the currently precarious "balance-of-terror". With our present capability of near world destruction, serious question must be raised in regard to any increase in that capability. We, therefore, urge a concerted effort for international arms agreements with our adversaries, prior to deployment of such a system.

(3) *Cost benefit.*—In the recent Senate Foreign Affairs Committee hearings formidable questions were raised in regard to the system's capabilities. In light of the questionable reliability of such a system, the costs appear even more appalling. Nine billion dollars at this time is the estimated appropriated cost of the A.B.M. system. We ask: Are there alternative defense systems available at a lower cost? We think there are!

(4) *Obsolescence.*—What may be the most tragic end result is that after gross federal expenditures at the sacrifice of all citizens, the system may be obsolete within a few years of its deployment.

In summary, these observations demonstrate a reliable position for total reexamination of the deployment of an Anti-Ballistic Missile System.

4. We favor the speedy initiation of disarmament talks between the United States and the Soviet Union.

5. We believe that the United States must encourage direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab nations to secure lasting peace in the Middle East.

6. We support the inclusion of Red China as a member of the United Nations.

3. Voting and elections

1. The New York State Young Democrats resolve that the voting age in New York State should be lowered to eighteen (18) years. We call upon all of New York's elected officials to give this piece of legislation the highest priority. We further resolve not to support any candidates who will not pledge themselves to this goal.

We call for this legislation because of what can be termed a "crisis of legitimacy" facing our political system. In order for a political system, such as ours, to make demands upon segments of its population, it must allow for full participation in that system. This is not the case for our citizens between the ages of 18 and 21. They are called upon to make the extreme sacrifice for their country and yet are denied participation in its government. This situation is a contradiction to the concept of democracy.

We further believe that those citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 are qualified to vote. We believe that their educational training prepares them adequately for full participation.

We further believe that a lowering of the voting age to 18 years would act to decrease the present high level of alienation among the young. The high level of activism in today's youth must be encouraged. It must, however, be encouraged for participation within the democratic framework. The 18-year vote is essential for convincing youth to work within the system.

2. We state our intention to join in a statewide, non-partisan effort to gain the support of members of the New York State Legislature to lower the voting age.

3. We urge the New York State Legislature to amend the primary law to require the direct election of ALL delegates to the national political conventions, and to require that all delegates pledged to a particular presidential candidate be paired and identified with that candidate on the primary ballot.

4. We urge the passage of legislation to permit the casting of absentee ballots in primary elections.

4. Gun control

1. We propose the adoption of more stringent gun control laws on the state and national levels, including the enforced registration of all guns and the licensing of all gun owners.

5. The draft

1. We propose the immediate adoption of a lottery system for selective service in which all 19-year-olds would participate.

2. We favor the adoption of national standards for the selective service system.

3. There should be a general amnesty for all men who have fled the country, or who are now serving prison sentences, because of the present draft laws.

6. Penal system

1. We favor the adoption of a total program of rehabilitation in our State's penal institutions including work release programs and other similar efforts within the confines of our prisons which seek to prepare prisoners for re-entry into society rather than to punish them for past mistakes.

2. We support efforts to correct the homosexuality and lesbianism which result from periods of long incarceration, through overnight conjugal visits with one's spouse.

7. Student dissent

1. We oppose all legislation which seeks to punish students who exercise their freedom of speech and their right to petition for redress of their grievances.

8. Migrant labor

1. We propose that state sanitary regulations be expanded to cover all facilities occupied by farm workers, whether or not they are used as such on a year-round basis.

2. We further propose that the protection of disability insurance, unemployment insurance, and the State Labor Relations Act be extended to farm workers.

9. Wiretapping and eavesdropping

1. We favor a total abolition of wiretapping and eavesdropping on any level as an invasion of rights against unreasonable search and seizure guaranteed by our Constitution.

10. The American Indian

1. The present state of the American Indian is disgraceful both in the United States in general and in New York State in particular. The New York State Young Democrats feel that a more intense investigation should be instituted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the proper state and national legislative committees to bring the standard of living of Indians up to the national average.

11. Transportation

1. We propose that less emphasis be placed on new highway programs, and that the State and Federal governments undertake massive rapid and mass transportation programs to alleviate the crowding of our cities and highways. New major highways that are built should be toll roads, commensurate with the nature of the traffic.

12. Taxes

1. We urge the Congress and the State Legislature to enact legislation to close tax loopholes which enable the rich to pay less taxes than the middle class.

13. Education (addenda)

a. We urge the New York State Legislature to restore mandated free tuition at the City University of New York, and establish a free tuition policy throughout the State University system. It is also imperative that the rapid rise in dormitory rates in the State University system be halted, and efforts be made to relieve financially hard-pressed students of the burden of these dormitory costs.

b. We favor a high school level course in Election Law for the purpose of preparing a voter for the complete exercise of his constitutional right to vote.

14. Narcotics (addendum)

a. We propose that general practitioners be allowed to prescribe narcotics to addicts under their care under strict federal, state and local control. We feel that a family physician, on a one-to-one relationship, will be able to effect a meaningful relationship with the addict.

15. Environment

1. We are clearly destroying our environment which sustains life. We believe that it is the function of the people to maintain a balanced ecology.

16. Consumer affairs

1. We propose the creation of a State Department of Consumer Affairs in order to represent the interests of the largest, yet least organized group in the State.

17. Youth in party organization

1. Whereas: The Democratic Party has experienced a depletion in the numbers of youths active within the organization; and

Whereas: We believe that our Party needs the enthusiasm, dedication, and determination of young people in order to revitalize our Party;

We believe that:

(1) Our Party leaders should make available at least twenty percent of their county committeemanships to young people between the ages of twenty-one and thirty;

(2) Our Party leaders should develop new positions of leadership for young people so that their views and aspirations can be made part of Party policy on local, county, state and national levels; and

(3) Our Party leaders should develop young candidates who will actively support positions vital to the young community.

18. New York City mayoralty election

1. We, the New York State Young Democrats, cannot in conscience endorse the candidacy of Mario Procaccino, Democratic candidate for Mayor of the City of New York.

2. In this matter, we feel that the individual must follow the dictates of his own political philosophy.

CONCLUSION

To all of the above programs and principles, we pledge our support and our dedicated efforts.

INDIAN IDENTITY AND SELF-DETERMINATION

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the August 29, 1969, Washington Post on the Right to be Indians, which calls for the preservation of Indian identity and endorses the principle of self-determination by our Indian citizens.

Too often in the past the Federal Government has done what it has thought best for the hopes and aspirations of the Indians. This paternalistic policy has resulted in maintaining Indians at a subsistence level while attempting to destroy their distinctive cultures as a preparation for rapid assimilation, a goal most Indians rejected.

Any Indian program for social and economic development, however, must be specifically tailored to Indian needs and cultures. Furthermore, the best hope for Indian progress lies in the emergence of Indian involvement. The Indian people must be given the opportunity to use their own leadership, to realize when they need help and to ask for it when they want it and on their own terms. This is the type of commitment the Indian people want and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post editorial follows:

THE RIGHT TO BE INDIANS

American Indians want the right to be Indians, to preserve their tribal identities and tribal lands, to make their own mistakes, to have a say about their destiny. That, in essence, is the message that emerged from the meeting in Denver of 40 Indian leaders from all parts of the nation to see whether a common program could be worked out to improve the status of the nation's oldest and poorest minority. The fact that they met together at all was remarkable. Indians do not view themselves as a single group, so jealous are they of their particular tribal, linguistic, cultural and territorial backgrounds. The significance of the Denver meeting is that they decided to look at their problems together and be heard as a group. If it works, the meeting may prove to be of historic importance in the long effort of America to solve its "indian problem."

The message of Denver itself is not an unfamiliar one, from American Indians or other ethnic groups. But few white Americans have listened in the past when Indians spoke—a reflection of a general national feeling that assimilation and absorption into the contemporary American "mainstream" is the ultimate answer for this country's first inhabitants. The Indians made it clear that they are not buying this answer. They want the option to remain on their lands and work out ways of improving their economic and social condition within the tribal framework. Some will leave as many thousands have done. But they do not want to be compelled to go and there is no good reason why they should be.

The group declared that the strength of America lies in its "plural society made up of different races and ethnic groups." In effect, they were saying that their cause is not too startlingly different from the cause of black Americans, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans and other ethnic minorities that have been voicing their desires to maintain group identification. Spurred by the Community Action Program, the political arm of our national anti-poverty effort, this has become a respectable and accepted goal for urban dwellers. Why not for Indians too?

By coincidence, the Denver group assembled while administration officials concerned with Indian matters were meeting at State Line, Nev., with some selected Indian representatives. Both meetings revealed the existence of deep distrust of the administration's intentions, part of it the historic distrust of the white man and part a fear that the Republican administration will go back to the old program of "termination," of forcing Indians off their lands. The sounds being made by administration spokesmen are not reassuring in this regard. Interior Secretary Hickel has suggested that the Indians must "cut the cord" of dependence on the reservation sooner or later and other officials have suggested that it may be desirable to transfer specific Indian programs to the states.

The Indian effort to improve their lot needs to be encouraged. With Indian participation at every level, ways should be found to better the existence of the nation's 600,000 Indians, to improve their health, their education, their economic conditions—both on and off the reservation, and without destroying their identity as Indians.

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION CUTBACKS ENDANGER PROGRESS AND SAFETY

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was both alarmed and astounded to read in today's newspapers a report that Vice President AGNEW has informed the Nation's Governors that the Nixon administration is considering a cutback of possibly 75 percent in Federal construction expenditures for the announced purpose of "fighting inflation."

It is almost unbelievable that the man who was recently reported advocating a space flight to Mars is proposing drastic reductions in U.S. programs for flood control, water supply, highway construction, hospitals, schools, and other essential domestic requirements.

In testimony before the House Committee on Public Works today, Federal Highway Administrator Frank Turner told committee members of the serious need for replacement of thousands of highway bridges in the United States—which must be replaced by new structures in the interest of public safety at the earliest date possible.

The committee was told that the Department of Transportation had no official word of any impending cutback in highway funding along the lines discussed in Colorado by the Vice President—but highways would probably share the fate of other Federal programs.

In my personal view, it would be an inexcusable tragedy to delay our bridge modernization program—and the cost would be measured in thousands of lives. The same can be said for delays in needed flood control projects, needed hospitals, needed airport safety improvements—and a host of other Federal programs. Certainly it is no time to cut back on aids to school construction at either the elementary, secondary, or college level.

Let us hope and pray that the Vice President was either reported inaccurately, or launching a trial ballon which will speedily be deflated.

For the record, I believe it appropriate to submit the last expression of the Congress on the subject of executive impounding of highway funds:

PROHIBITION OF IMPOUNDMENT OF APPORTIONMENTS AND DIVERSION OF FUNDS

SEC. 15. Section 101 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) It is the sense of Congress that under existing law no part of any sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure upon any Federal-aid system which has been apportioned pursuant to the provisions of this title shall be impounded or withheld from obligation, for purposes and projects as provided in this title, by any officer or employee of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Federal Government, except such specific sums as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, are necessary to be withheld from obligation for specific periods of time to assure that sufficient amounts will be available in the highway trust fund to defray the expenditures which will be required to be made from such fund.

"(d) It is the sense of Congress that funds authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund may be used to pay only those administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration (including the Bureau of Public Roads) which are incurred under this title and are attributable to Federal-aid highways. No funds authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund shall be used to pay the administrative expenses of any other Federal department, agency, office, or instrumentality, or any other agency, instrumentality, or entity established by Federal law, executive order, or otherwise by the Federal Government, either by transfer of funds, reassignment of personnel or activities, contract, or otherwise, unless the expenditures are to meet obligations incurred under this title, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways and are—

"(1) contracted for in accordance with the Act of March 4, 1915, as amended (31 U.S.C. 686) and (A) relate to work or services of a type not usually performed by the Federal Highway Administration or (B) relate to the furnishing of materials, supplies, or equipment; or

"(2) Are specifically identified in the budget and included in an appropriation Act."

The paragraphs above cited are a clear and unmistakable statement of the law as reflected in Public Law 90–495, enacted August 23, 1968. Surely an administration dedicated to "law and order" is not preparing to ignore this clear statement of the law.

The conference report which accompanied this measure reinforces the statute as to congressional intent. The report stated:

The conference substitute amends section 101 of title 23 which contains the general declaration of policy applicable to that title declaring it to be the sense of Congress that funds apportioned shall not be impounded or withheld from obligation, and further declaring it to be the sense of Congress that funds authorized to be appropriated from the highway trust fund may be used to pay only the administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration (including the Bureau of Public Roads) incurred under title 23 and attributable to Federal-aid highways. No funds authorized to be appropriated from the highway trust fund are to be used to pay the administrative expenses of any other Federal department, agency, office, or instrumentality or entity established by Federal law, Executive order, or otherwise by transfer of funds, reassignment of personnel or activities, contract, or otherwise, unless they are to meet obligations incurred under title 23 which are attributable to Federal-aid highways and are contracted for in accordance with the Economy Act and related either to work or service of a type not usually performed by the Federal Highway Administration or to the furnishing of materials, supplies, or equipment or specifically identified in the budget and included in an appropriation act.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the administration will obey the law on highway funds. Let us also hope that a careful review of the entire cutback proposal will lead to its early, sensible modification.

LIFE MAGAZINE EDITORIAL CRITICAL OF NIXON DRUG APPROACH

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the September 5 issue of Life magazine contains a critical editorial comment on President Nixon's approach to the narcotic addiction and drug abuse problem. The proposed administration drug law takes a simplistic and unworkable "law enforcement" approach to the issue. As sponsor of the proposed Comprehensive Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse Care and Control Act of 1969, I have been quite concerned with the problem and have called for a more sensitive and realistic approach in this area. The Life editorial calls for congressional changes in the Nixon proposal. My bill, H.R. 13136, already contains the changes called for by Life magazine.

I include into the RECORD the text of the editorial and recommend my colleagues' careful perusal of it. I again call for swift congressional action on drug control, research and treatment legislation. As I have stated before, time is of the essence in this area and lives are at stake.

The editorial follows:

THE NIXON DRUG LAW: A CRUCIAL FAULT

Drug abuse and marijuana, once largely confined to the shadowy underworld of junkie row, are now very much in the open. In Chicago, helping the acid-head next door is Topic A at suburban PTAs. In Los Angeles, dinner-party hostesses have been known to lay out reefers alongside the bread and butter plates. At the phenomenal Woodstock music festival of a fortnight ago (LIFE, Aug. 29), the police simply had to look the other way, since the number of kids openly puffing marijuana was in the tens of thousands.

While all kinds of "soft" drugs are being marketed to middle-class children like so many new detergents for suburban housewives, most hard narcotics tragedies still occur in the poor urban ghettos—and the number of these is soaring. Deaths attributed to heroin abuse in New York City alone totaled over 700 last year, and the body count this summer is running 58% higher than in 1968.

How to deal with what President Nixon has called this "rising sickness in our land" is the subject of a recent White House message to Congress proposing a new set of federal drug laws. The President rightly criticized the "common over-simplification" which treats narcotics addiction and drug abuse as "a law enforcement problem alone." But the bill he sent to Congress takes the simplistic "law enforcement" approach. Congress should amend Nixon's proposals to give the nation's drug laws both more enlightenment and greater effectiveness.

There is one most welcome feature in the Administration bill: it includes the powerful hallucinogen LSD in the basic criminal drug law. But Nixon's proposals put LSD and hard narcotics like heroin in the same class with infinitely less harmful marijuana. The possession of any of them would be a felony, and prison terms for marijuana and narcotics offenses remain unchanged.

The failure to distinguish between marijuana and hard narcotics is the crucial fault in Nixon's bill. The American Medical Association, though vigorously opposed to legalization of marijuana, has condemned the present federal laws dealing with it as "harsh and unrealistic." Nixon's proposals would not soften them. A youngster caught smoking marijuana not only could be given two to 10 years in prison, but would have the permanent stigma of a felony conviction. A student who gives a reefer to his roommate could get the mandatory minimum sentence of five years for "distributing" the drug. Because such a law obviously could not be enforced against the "several million" college-age youngsters who the President concedes are at least occasionally turning on, the proposed bill is unrealistic.

Marijuana should not be legalized. Legalization would increase consumption at a time when research into long-term effects has barely begun, and it could change the nature of the marijuana problem from the "spree" smoking generally encountered in the U.S. to widespread, habitual use. That marijuana is far less harmful than other drugs is no reason to inflict it on our society. It is, however, a compelling reason for our laws to distinguish clearly between marijuana and hard narcotics.

Some Administration officials insist that harsh marijuana penalties will not be invoked against youthful experimenters. They maintain that the provisions are nonetheless vital to deter potential drug abusers and to punish professional pushers who regularly escape detection on more serious narcotics trafficking charges. But in fact, the evidence is that marijuana penalties neither deter amateurs nor root out professionals: since the penalties were raised in 1956, juvenile drug arrests have risen more than 800%, and hardly a dent has been made in the volume of professional narcotics traffic.

Bad drug laws, like bad acid trips, can have terrible side effects. By branding many youngsters as felonious criminals, the present laws make it difficult for teenage dropouts from society ever to drop back in; they discourage young drugtakers who need medical help from seeking it; and they give parents and educators an untenable choice between tolerating defiance of the law or turning in their children for retribution they believe to be harmful and unjust.

Perhaps most unfortunate of all, the marijuana penalties the Administration wants to continue are so unrealistic that they undermine respect for the rest of our narcotics laws. (Even the courts are often reluctant to impose marijuana penalties that seem grossly out of proportion to the nature of the offense. This may help explain why less than 1% of those arrested on "soft" drug charges are ever convicted.)

Congress should reduce the possession of marijuana from a felony to a misdemeanor. (Some medical and legal authorities feel it should be treated the same way as the violation of a local ordinance—that is, by a fine with no criminal charge.) Though marijuana has no proven physiological ill effects, it temporarily distorts perception, judgment of distance and visual focus, and the user is often under the illusion that his sensibilities are unusually sharp when in fact they have been dulled. For these reasons, lower penalties for marijuana use should probably be supplemented by penalties for driving an automobile under the influence of marijuana.

The Administration proposal provides one loophole that judges are sure to exploit in marijuana cases: a first-time offender for possession of any drug may be released on probation rather than receive a felony conviction. But a more intelligent and flexible proposal would separate marijuana from hard drugs and give judges the discretion to treat them with the difference they deserve.

MIDDLE EAST FLARES AGAIN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the potential for full-scale war in the Middle East once again developing, it is imperative that the situation there be understood in all of its complications.

The Chicago Daily News in an editorial Tuesday, August 26, comments in a very analytical and effective manner on the latest Middle East developments.

The article follows:

MIDDLE EAST FLARES AGAIN

Step by perilous step, the Middle East appears to be marching to the brink of full-fledged war. Iraq's barbarous execution of 15 more men identified as "spies for the United States and Israel" is another in a series of inflammatory acts increasing tensions close to the breaking point.

The truth is hard to find in the Middle East, and if found there is no assurance it will be accepted. The Arabs refuse to believe that the Israeli account of the burning of a mosque in Jerusalem is true. The Israeli government says it has a confession from an Australian Christian, but Arab leaders call for a "holy war" against Israel in retaliation for the desecration of their holy place.

The Israelis see in Iraq's spy executions another turn of the screws on Jews remaining in the Arab lands. Though only two of the 15 men executed were Jews. Iraq's charge that they were all linked with Israel—and somehow with the United States—fits in with the rising passions of the area. Israel reports that Iraqi Jews are being systematically oppressed, and some reprisal against Iraq is expected.

Raids and counter-raids all along Israel's borders have become so frequent that United Nations Sec.-Gen. U Thant weeks ago said a state of "open warfare" existed. His reference was primarily to the Suez area, where troops and planes of the United Arab Republic face those of Israel. But increased activity on the borders of Syria and Lebanon and now the twist of events in the old quarter of Jerusalem and in Iraq add fuel to the flames.

The United Nations has proved singularly ineffective in coping with the Middle East turmoil, and there is little hope that it can do more now, particularly when Russia continues to arm the Arab states and encourages the UAR's President Nasser in his frequent boasts that he will destroy Israel.

Outside the Arab states, the one nation that could do most to reverse the march toward war is Russia, by stemming the flow of armament and forcing the issue to the peace table. But it suits Russia's purpose to pose as the great friend of the Arabs, and encourage Nasser in his impossible dream.

It is hard to believe that Russia would welcome a new outbreak of full-scale war in the Middle East. But until the Arabs themselves realize that they are playing the pawn in Russia's game, the risk of further escalation remains.